BRISTOL
LIBRARY
342

Certamen Religiosum:

OR,

A CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

The late King of ENGLAND, and the late Lord Marqueſſe of *Worceſter*, concerning RELIGION.

TOGETHER WITH

A VINDICATION

OF THE

PROTESTANT CAUSE,

From the Pretences of the Marqueſſe his Laſt Papers; which the neceſſity of the KING's Affaires denyed him Oportunity to Anſwer.

LONDON,

Printed for *W. Lee*, at the Turks Head in F[illegible]
and *R. Royſton* at the Angel in *Ivie-l*[illegible]

1651.

230.2
Aug 230.4
Cards
2550

TO THE READER.

COURTEOUS READER,

I *Doe not deſire by way of Preface to trouble Thee with many words, but ſomething I muſt crave leave to ſay, that thou mayeſt the better underſtand the reaſon and nature of this enſuing worke. It may be thou art not unacquainted with a Booke, which now hath beene extant ſome* * *years. The title of it is* Certamen Religioſum, *and it containeth in it a Conference, which was held partly by word of mouth, but chiefly by Writing, betwixt the late King and the Marqueſſe of* Worceſter, *a ſtiffe defender of the Romiſh Religion. To the Marqueſſes firſt Plea (I ſpeake of that, which paſſed betwixt them in writing) the King returned Anſwer; but the Marqueſſe replying, the Kings occaſions (it ſeemes) would not permit him to rejoyne, eſpecially the Reply being ſo large, and ſo thick lin'd with quotations, that the peruſall and examination of it would require no little time. I know there are* * *ſome, who account this Conference no better then ſuppoſititious; which reflecting upon the Publiſher of it, Doctor* Baily, *he hath lately in a Preface to a* † *Booke, which hee hath ſet forth of his own, vindicated himſelf, and aſſerted the Conference. For my part, I know no cauſe to queſtion the truth of the Relation, neither, as to my purpoſe, is it much materiall, whether*

* It was publiſhed *Anno* 1649.

* See the Advertiſement to the Reader perfixed to the late Kings workes ſet forthtogether in one volume.

† It is intituled (as I remember) *Herba Parietis*, or *The Wall-flower.*

there were any ſuch Conference; or if there were, whether it were ſo mannaged, as is related. This I ſee, that in the Booke before mentioned (to wit, Certamen Religioſum) *the Romiſh cauſe is ſet out in great pompe, both Scriptures and Fathers being produced as aſſerting moſt of thoſe opinions, which they of the Church of* Rome *maintaine, and we impugne, and the Reader is left naked, and unfurniſhed with any Armes and Weapons, wherewith either to defend himſelfe, or to offend his adverſary ſave onely as he ſhall be able to provide for himſelfe, and bring with him. The firſt time that I heard the Booke mentioned, (which was about the laſt Spring it was ſpoken of as a Booke of no little danger, and ſo (I underſtand ſince) diverſe judge of it. Yea, I have heard that ſome have ſaid, that the Marqueſſe in this Reply hath done more for the Church of* Rome, *then any have done before him. When I got the Booke, and looked a while into it, though I ſaw no reaſon to conceive ſo highly of it, as (it ſeemes) ſome have done, yet I found in it I confeſſe) much more then I expected, ſo much as that I thought it* operæ pretium *no miſ-pent time to anſwer it. This I have indeavoured; how I have performed it, is left to Thee (Reader) to judge. The great difficulty in the undertaking did ariſe from the multitude of Authors that are alleged (whether the Marqueſs himſelfe did peruſe theſe authors, or tooke them upon truſt from others, I will not inquire, much leſſe determine) eſpecially conſidering how lax and looſe the quotations are, the words of the Authors being ſcarce once in a hundred times cited, and ſometimes onely the Authour named, many times only the Book, but no Chapter or Section mentioned. In this reſpect it could not be expected, that every allegation ſhould receive a punctuall anſwer, beſides that as in the* Rejoynder *it ſelfe upon occaſion I acknowledge) ſometimes for want of the Authour I had not liberty*

to

*to examine what is alleged; but this (I preſume) will not be found ſo frequent, nor yet at all prejudiciall to the maine, ſo much ſtill being ſaid as may ſuffice to take off the force of that which is objected. There is an anſwer already come forth to the Marqueſſes laſt Paper, with which I have to deale. The * authour of it is a gentleman of much reading, well verſed in Greek and Latin writers, both Eccleſiaſticall and others, as appears by this work, which is all that I have ſeene of his, though I hear of ſomething elſe that he hath publiſhed not without great commendation. I had undertaken this task before I had any intimation that another was about it: and I think this of mine was at the Preſſe before the foreſaid Anſwer came from it. I could not confine my ſelfe to ſuch narrow bounds as that Gentleman hath done in anſwer to the Marqueſſe, (for he hath others alſo beſides him to deal with) the reaſon of his conciſenes is beſt knowne unto himſelfe. I have launched further into the deepe, and have exſpatiated more in the diſcuſsion of thoſe points, which are handled by the Marqueſſe; yet ſo, as that the Reader (I hope) will have no cauſe to complaine of proxility, or to thinke me tedious. I have divided the worke into two parts; in the former part I have indeavoured to ſhew the ungroundednes of the Romiſh doctrine in thoſe points, which the Marqueſſe propoundeth, and the repugnancy of it both to Scriptures and Fathers, notwithſtanding any thing he hath alleged in defence of it. In the latter part I have laboured to wipe off thoſe aſperſions, which the Marqueſſe doth caſt upon diverſe of our moſt eminent Divines, and chiefe inſtruments in the worke of Reformation, as* Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, Melanchon *and* Beza, *partly in reſpect of their Doctrine, and partly in reſpect of their converſation. This the learned anſwerer before mentioned hath not attempted; but I did not think it meete to wave it, calumnies and reproches being more apt to prevaile*

* Hamon L'Eſtrange Eſquire.

with ſome then any other argument whatſoever. Some points of controverſie alſo, which the Marqueſſe taketh occaſion to bring in, having not mentioned them before, are inſiſted on in this ſecond Part. Some perhaps may ſay, Quorſum perditio hæc? *What needed all this? theſe controverſies haveing bin ſufficiently handled by our writers, both at home and abroad, long agoe. I anſwer, 'Tis true, they have bin ſo: yet if the Marqueſſe thought it not enough that* Bellarmine *and many others of the Romiſh party have written largely in that behalfe, but judged it meet to produce his own Plea; I think there is as much reaſon why we ſhould conſider what he ſaith, and that ſome anſwer ſhould be given him, that ſo none may boaſt, as ſome are apt to doe in ſuch a caſe, that becauſe hee is unanſwered, therfore he is unanſwerable. And beſides, though* (Nil dictum, quod non dictum priùs) *the matter be not new, yet there may be* (καινὰ καινῶς) *a handling of the ſame things in another manner: yea, and diverſe treating of the ſame ſubject, ſomething may be found in one, which is not in another. But (may ſome ſay) there are many other great and groſſe errours of late ſprung up among us, and theſe doe rather call for our care and diligence to ſuppreſſe them. For anſwer unto this, I grant that the prevailing errours of the times are mainly to be oppoſed; yet (as our Saviour ſaid in another caſe)* this ought to be done, and the other not to be left undone. *Yea, Popery is the grand evill that doth infeſt the Church; and by how much it is the more inveterate, & the more diffuſed, by ſo much the danger of it is the greater, and it requires the more oppoſition. There is alſo a ſpeciall warning to* come out of Babylon, *Revel.* 18.4. *and certainly it will availe us little to come out, except we alſo keepe out of it. And if we would keep our ſelves out of Babylon, we muſt keepe the Babyloniſh Doctrine from finding entertainment with us. This will aske no little care, no humane poli-*

cy

cy in the world (I think) being greater then that which is uſed either for the ſupporting of that doctrine where it is, or the introducing of it where it is not embraced. Shall we thinke that the Romaniſts are idle in theſe buſy times? Though few doe ſhew themſelves, as the Marqueſſe did, (γυμνῇ κεφαλῇ) with open face; yet we may well ſuſpect that many are working ſo, as that by how much they are the leſſe conſpicuous, by ſo much they are the more dangerous. And as David *in a certaine caſe ſaid to the woman of Tekoah,* Is not the hand of *Joab* with thee in all this? *So in reſpect of that heape of heterodox opinions that is among us, may it not be ſaid,* Is not the hand of a Ieſuite in all this? *Diverſe Pamphlets in theſe times have admoniſhed us to beware, and among the reſt one intituled* Mutatus Polemo *(what ever the Authors deſigne were) doth ſpeake not a little to this purpoſe. Before theſe troubleſome times began, ſome have either expreſſed (as Mr.* Archer*) or intimated (as Mr.* Mede*) that (in their opinion) Popery ſhall yet againe for a while univerſally prevaile in thoſe Countries and Nations, out of which it hath bin expelled. If this be ſo (as for any thing I ſee, I may hope the contrary) may it not be feared, that, as thoſe* many Antichriſts *(as they are called* 1 Joh. 2. 18.*) that is, thoſe many heretikes, that were in the primitive times, did make way for the riſe of that great Antichriſt; ſo theſe in our times may make way for the reſtauration of him? And whereas we have heard long ſince of* Romes Maſter-peece, *I ſee not how any Romiſh deſigne can better deſerve this title, then ſo to debaſe the Miniſtery, and to decry learning, as the practice of many is in theſe times.* Hoc Ithacus velit, hoc magno mercentur Atreidæ, *The Chieftaines of the Church of* Rome *can deſire nothing more, then that among their adverſaries the Miniſtery ſhould be caſt down, and learning overthrown. For then why ſhould they doubt but that they may ſoon reduce*

Arch. of Chriſts perſonall raign on Earth, *Page* 50. and 55. Mede on Revel. 11. 7.

all

all unto them, none being now of any competent ability to oppose them? It is observed by those that are acquainted with Ecclesiasticall History, that when Learning was the lowest, then Popery got to be highest; as the one decayed, so the other was advanced: and on the other side, that the restauration of good literature did make way for the Reformation of Religion. Surely, if Popery overspread againe, barbarisme and illiterateness is a most likely means to effect it. Neither are the Papists (I suppose) lesse politick, and wise in their generation then Julian *the Apostate was, who could see no fairer way, whereby to re establish Gentilisme, then by indeavouring to deveſt Christians of Learning, a thing so vile and odious, that* Ammianus Marcellinus *himselfe, though a Pagan, and a great admirer of* Julian, *was ashamed of it, and shewed great dislike of* Julian *for it, calling it a* cruell part, and a thing to be buried in perpetuall silence. *But I have held Thee (Reader) longer then I did intend; I will preface no further, but praying unto the Lord to preserve his Church from errors without, and to purge it from errors within, I rest*

Qui in historiarum Ecclesiasticarum lectione versati sunt, Christiani populi ignorantiam, & Romanæ sedis authoritatem simul auctam facilè animadvertere potuerunt.——Vicissimque ut bonarum literarum instauratione facessere cæpit ignorantia, ita & Pontificis authoritas paulatim im ninui & labascere visa est. *Gentillet, Exam. Concil. Tridem. lib. 1. Sect. 7. & 8. vide plura*

Illud autem inclemens obruendum perenni silentio, quòd arcebat docere Magistros Rhetoricos & Grammaticos ritûs Christiani cultores. *Am. Marcell. de Julia. lib. 22.*

Thy Friend and lover in the truth

CHR. CARTVVRIGHT.

THE CONTENTS
OF THE
FIRST PART.

1 *OF the marks of the true Church, which they of the Church of* Rome *assigne, as Universality, Antiquity, Visibility, Succession of Pastors, unity in Doctrine, and the Coversion of Nations,* Page 107, to 114

2 *Of having recourse unto the Scriptures in matters that concern Religion,* 114, 115, 116

3 *Of relying either on Fathers singly and severally considered, or on a generall Councel,* 116, 117, 118, 119

4 *That the Apostles, as Pen-men of the Holy Ghost, could not erre,* 120

5 *Of the easinesse and plainnesse of the Scriptures,* 120, 121

6 *Of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper,* 122, to 140

7 *Whether the Church hath any infallible rule besides the Scripture for the understanding of Scripture,* 140, to 147

8 *Againe of the Scriptures being easie to be understood,* 147, 148

9 *Whether the Church can erre, or not,* 148, to 152

10 *Againe of the Visibility of the Church,* 152, 153

11 *Of the Universality of the Church,* 153, to 158

12 *Of the unity of the Church in matters of faith,* 158, 159

13 *Of Kings and Queens being Heads or Governours*

and Goverueſſes of the Church within their Dominions, 159,160
14 *Of the Miniſters power to forgive ſins*, 159 (as 'tis miſprinted) to 162
15 *Of confeſſing ſins to a ghoſtly Father*, 162, to 172
16 *Of works of Supererogation*, 172, to 176
17 *Of Free-will*, 176, to 195
18 *Of the poſſibility of keeping the Commandements*, 196, to 201
19 *Of Juſtification by faith alone*, 201, to 211
20 *Of Merits*, 211 to 216
21 *Whether juſtifying faith may be loſt*, 216 to 221
22 *Of Reprobation*, 221 to 239
23 *Of aſſurance of Salvation*, 239 to 251
24 *Whether every Believer hath a peculiar Angel to be his guardian*, 251 to 254
25 *Of the Angels praying for us, and knowing our thoughts*, 254, 255, 256
26 *Of praying to the Angels*, 256 to 261
27 *Whether the Saints deceaſed know our affairs here below*, 261, to 266
28 *Of the Saints deceaſed praying for us*, 266, to 269
29 *Of praying to the Saints deceaſed*, 269, to 276
30 *Of Confirmation, whether it be a Sacrament properly ſo called*, 276, to 281
31 *Of communicating in one kinde*, 281, to 287
32 *Of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, as they call it: or whether Chriſt be truly and properly offered up and ſacrificed in the Euchariſt, or Lords Supper*, 287, to 296
33 *Whether Orders (or rather Ordination) be a Sacrament of like nature with Baptiſme and the Lord Supper*, 296, to 301

34 *Of*

34 *Of Vows of chaſtity, and of the Marriage of Eccleſiaſtical perſons,* 301, to 318
35 *Of Chriſts deſcending into Hell,* 319, to 340
36 *Of Purgatory,* 340, to 355
37 *Of extreme Unction,* 355, to 363
38 *Of the ſaying of Auſtine,* Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Eccleſiæ Authoritas commoveret, *I ſhould not believe (or ſhould not have believed,* crederem *for* credidiſſem) *the Goſpel, except the authority of the Church did move (or had moved,* comoveret *for* commoviſſet) *me to it.* 364, 365, *&c.

The Contents of the Second Part of the *Rejoynder.*

1 OF *the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Church of* England, Page 1, 2
2 *Of* Luthers *Doctrine,* 3, to 20
3 Zuinglius *vindicated from that which by the way is charged upon him,* 19
4 *Of* Calvines *Doctrine,* 20, to 35
5 *Of* Zuinglius *his Doctrine,* 35, to 40
6 *Of* Melancthons *Doctrine,* 40, 41, 42. *(addition.*
7 *Of* Andreas Muſculus *his Doctrine,* 42. *and in the*
8 *Of the diviſions that are among Proteſtants,* 42
9 *Of that Unity which is among them of the Church of* Rome, 42, to 46
10 *Of Crimes charged upon Proteſtants, and the teſtimonies alledged for proof of them,* 46
11 *Of* Luthers *conference with the Devil,* 46, 47, 48
12 *Whether* Zuinglius *were an Authour of war, and a diſturber of peace, &c.* 48, 49
13 Beza *cleared of a foul aſperſion caſt upon him,* 49, 50
14 *Of* Luthers *writing againſt King* Henry 8. 50, 51

15 *Of*

15 Of the people of the reformed Churches, whether they be so vitious and corrupt, as they are censured, 51,52
16 A vindication of Calvin in respect of vild aspersions cast upon him, 53,54
17 Mantuans testimony concerning Rome, and the corrupt estate of it, 54, 55
18 Whether the Doctrine of the Church of Rome be the the same still that it was at first, 55
19 Of Prayers for the Dead, 55,56,57
20 Of Lent-Fast, 57,58
21 Of mingling Water with Wine in the Lords Supper, 58,59,60
22 Of diverse ceremonies, which the Church of Rome useth in Baptisme, 60,61
23 Of the necessity of Infants Baptisme, and whether they may be saved without it, 61,62,63
24 Of the several Ecclesiastical Orders which they have in the Church of Rome, 63,64,65
25 Of the Pope and his supremacy, 65,66,67
26 Of service in an unknown tongue, 67,68,69
27 Of Festivals, 69,70
28 Of Reliques, 70,71
29 Of Pictures and Images, 71, to 77
30 Of the signe of the Crosse, 77
31 Of Luther, Husse, and Wickliffe holding some errours, and so others that oppose the Church of Rome, 78
32 That some before Berengarius, as namely Bertram, did professedly impugne that reall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which they of the Church of Rome maintain, 79,80

Certamen

BRISTOL MUSEUM

CERTAMEN RELIGIOSUM:

OR,

A CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

The late King of *England*, and the late Lord Marqueſſe of *Worceſter*, concerning Religion, at His Majeſties being at *Ragland*-Caſtle, 1646.

Marqueſſe.

SIr, I hope if they catch us in the act, it will not be deemed in me an act of ſo high conſpiracy, in regard that I enter the liſts, leaning upon a Doctor of your own Church.

To whom the King replyed as merrily, My Lord, I know not whether I ſhould have a better opinion of your Lordſhip for the Doctors ſake, or a worſe opinion of the Doctor for your Lordſhips ſake; for though you leane much upon his arme, yet he may lean more upon your judgment.

Marq. *Sir, it conduceth a little to the purpoſe we have in hand, to be a little ſerious in the thing you ſpeak of: your Majeſty knows the grounds of my acquaintance with the Doctor, and my obligation to him, which difference in opinion ſhall never mitigate in point of affection; but I proteſt unto you, I could never gain the leaſt ground of him yet, in perſwading him from his principles.*

King. It may be your Lordſhip hopes to meet with a weaker Diſputant of me.

Marq. *Not ſo, and if it pleaſe your Majeſty, but I think thus: That if it ſhould pleaſe God to make me ſo happy an inſtrument of his Churches good, as to be a means to incline your royall heart to imbrace the truth, I beleeve that he, and thouſands ſuch as he, would be ſoon brought to follow your Majeſty in the right way, who are ſo conſtant followers of your ſteps whilſt you are in a wrong path: the Oaths which they have taken, the relation which their Hierarchy have to the Crown, which muſt be no longer ſo, but whilſt the government of the Church and ſoules, ſtand as a reſerve to the regiment of lives and fortunes, the preferment which they expect from your Majeſty, and the enjoyment of thoſe preferments which they have already, which they muſt no longer enjoy, then whilſt they are, or ſeem to be of your opinion, cauſeth them to ſmother their own knowledge, whilſt their mouths are ſtopt with intereſt; whereas if the ſtrong Tide of your Majeſties opinion were but once turn'd, all the ſhips in the river would ſoon turn head.* "Hereupon the "Marqueſſe fell abruptly from his ſubject, and asked "the King, *Sir, I pray tell me what is it that you want?* The "King ſmiled a little at his ſudden breaking off, and "making ſuch prepoſterous haſte to aske that queſtion, "anſwered,

King. My Lord, I want an Army, can you help me to one?

Marq.

Marq. *Yes, that I can; and to ſuch a one, as ſhould your Majeſty commit your ſelf to their fidelity, you ſhould be a Conquerour, fight as often as you pleaſe.*

King. My Lord, ſuch an Army would do the buſineſſe: I pray let me have it.

Marq. *What if your Majeſty would not confide in it, when it ſhould be preſented unto you?*

King. My Lord, I would fain ſee it, and as fain confide in that, of which I had reaſon to be confident.

Marq. *Take* Gedeons *three hundred men, and let the reſt be gone.*

King. Your Lordſhip ſpeaks myſtically, will it pleaſe you to be plain a little?

Marq. *Come, I ſee I muſt come nearer to you: Sir, it is thus: God expected a work to be done by your hands, but you have not anſwered his expectation, nor his mercy towards you: when your enemies had more Cities and Garriſons, then you had private families to take your part; when they had more Cannons then you had Muskets; when the people crouded to heap treaſures againſt you, whilſt your Majeſties friends were fain here and there to make a gathering for you; when they had Navies at Sea, whilſt your Majeſty had not ſo much as a Boat upon the River; whilſt the oddes in number againſt you was like a full crop againſt a gleaning; then God wrought his miracle, in making your gleaning bigger then their vintage; he put the power into your hand, and made you able to declare your ſelf a true man to God, and gratefull to your friends: but like the man whom the Prophet makes mention of, who beſtowed great coſt and paines upon his vineyard, and at laſt it brought forth nothing but wilde grapes; ſo when God had done all theſe things for You, and expected that You ſhould have given his Church ſome reſpit to their oppreſſions, I heard ſay, You made vows*

* Naſeby Fight.

*that if God bleſt You but * that day with Victory, You would not leave a Catholike in Your Army; for which I feare the Lord is ſo angry with You, that (I am afraid) he will not give you another day wherein you may ſo much as trie your fortune: Your Majeſty had forgot the monies which came unto you from unknown hands, and were brought unto you by unknown faces, when you promiſed you would never forſake your unknown friends; you have forgotten the miraculous bleſsings of the Almighty upon thoſe beginnings, and how have you diſcountenanc'd, diſtruſted, diſ-regarded, I, and diſgraced the Catholiques all along, and at laſt vowed an extirpation of them: Doth not your Majeſty ſee clearly, how that in the two great Battailes, the* North *and* Naſeby, *God ſhewed ſignes of his diſpleaſure, when in the firſt your Enemies were even at your mercy, confuſion fell upon you, and you loſt the day, like a man that ſhould ſo wound his Enemies, that he could ſcarce ſtand, and afterwards his owne ſword ſhould fly out of the hilt, and leave the ſtrong and skilfull to the mercy of his falling Enemies; and in the ſecond (and I feare me the laſt Battaile that e're you'le fight) whilſt your men were crying victory, as I hear they had reaſon ſo to do, your ſword broke in the aire, which made you a fugitive to your flying Enemies: Sir, I pray pardon my boldneſſe, for it is Gods cauſe that makes me ſo bold, and no inclination of my owne to be ſo, and give me leave to tell you, that God is angry with you, and will never be pleaſed, untill you have taken new reſolutions concerning your Religion: which I pray God direct you, or elſe you'le fall from nought to worſe, from thence to nothing.*

King. My Lord; I cannot ſo much blame as pitty your zeal; the ſoundneſſe of Religion is not to be tried by dint of ſword, nor muſt we judge of her truthes by the proſperity of events, for then of all men Chriſtians would

would be moſt miſerable; we are not to be thought followers of Chriſt, by obſervations drawne from what is croſſe or otherwiſe, but by taking up our croſſe and following Chriſt. Neither do I remember my Lord, that I made any ſuch vow before the Battaile of *Naſeby* concerning Catholiques, but ſome ſatisfaction I did give my Proteſtant Subjects, who on the other ſide were perſwaded that God bleſt us the worſe for having ſo many Papiſts in our Army.

Marq. *The difference is not great, I pray God forgive you, who have moſt reaſon to aske it.*

King. I think not ſo my Lord.

Marq. *Who ſhall be judge?*

King. I pray my Lord, let us ſit down, and let reaſon take her ſeat.

Marq. *Reaſon is no judge.*

King. But ſhe may take her place.

Marq. *Not above our Faith.*

King. But in our arguments.

Marq. *I beſeech your Majeſty to give me a reaſon why you are ſo much offended with our Church?*

King. Truly my Lord, I am much offended with your Church, if you meane the Church of *Rome*, if it were for no other reaſon, but this, for that ſhe hath foiſted into her legend, ſo many ridiculous ſtories, as are able to make (as much as in them lies) Chriſtianitie it ſelfe a fable, whereas if they had not done this wrong unto the tradition of the primitive Church, we then had left unto us ſuch rare and unqueſtionable verities, as would have adorned, and not dawb'd the Goſpel, whereas now we know not, what is true, or falſe.

Marq. *Sir, if it be allowed to queſtion, what the Catholick Church holds out for truth, becauſe that which they*

hold forth unto us ſeemes ridiculous, and to picke and chuſe verities according to our owne fancie, and reject as novelties and forgeries what we pleaſe, as impoſsibilites and fabulous; the Scriptures themſelves may as well ſuffer by this kind of tolleration: for what more ridiculous then the Dialogue betweene Balaam *and his Aſs, or that* Sampſons *ſtrength ſhould be in his hair, or that he ſhould ſlay a thouſand men with the Jaw-bone of an Aſs, the Diſputation betweene Saint* Michael *and the* Devill *about the body of* Moſes; Philip's *being taken up in the air, and found at* Azotus, *with a thouſand the like ſtrange, and to our apprehenſion (if we looke upon them with carnall eyes) vaine and ridiculous: but being they are recorded in Scripture, which Scripture we hold for truth, we admire, but never queſtion them: ſo the fault may not be in the tradition of the Church, but in the libertie which men aſſume to themſelves to queſtion the tradition. And I beſeech Your Majeſtie, to conſider the ſtreaks that are drawn over the Divine writ, as ſo many delenda's, by ſuch bold hands as thoſe: the Teſtaments were not like the two Tables, delivered into the hands of any* Moſes, *by the immediate hand of God, neither by the Miniſtration of Angels, but men inſpired with the holy Ghoſt writ, whoſe writings by the Church were approved to be by inſpiration, which inſpirations were called Scripture, which Scriptures, moſt of them, as they are now received into our hands, were not received into the Canon of the Church, all, within three hundred years after Chriſt; why may not ſome bold ſpirits call all thoſe Scriptures (which were afterwards acknowledged to be Scripture, and were not before) forgeries. Nay have not ſome ſuch (as blind as bold) done it already? Saint* Hierom *was the firſt that ever pickt a hole in the Scriptures, and cut out ſo many books out of the word of God, with the penknife of* Apocrypha; Ruffinus *challengeth*

lengeth him for ſo doing, and tells him of the gap, that he hath opened for wild beaſts to enter into this field of the Church, and tread downe all ill corne. Jerom *gives his reaſons, becauſe they were not found in the Originall Copie, (as if the ſame ſpirit which gave to thoſe, whom it did inſpire, the diverſities of tongues, ſhould it ſelfe be tied to one language) but withall he acknowledgeth thus much of thoſe books, which he had thus markt in the forehead,* Canonici ſunt ad informandos mores, ſed non ad confirmandam fidem: *how poor a Diſtinction this is, and how pernitious a preſident this was, I leave it to Your Majeſtie to judge: for after him* Luther *takes the like boldneſs, and at once takes away the three Goſpels, of* Mark, Luke, *and* John; *Others take away the epiſtle to the* Hebrews, *others the epiſtle of Saint* Jude, *others the ſecond and third epiſtles of Saint* Peter, *others the epiſtle of Saint* James, *others the whole book of the* Revelation. *Wherefore to permit what the Church propoſes to be queſtionable by particular men, is to bring down the Church, the Scriptures, and the Heavens upon our heads. There was a Church, before there was a Scripture, which Scripture (as to us) had not beene the Word of God, if the Church had not made it ſo, by teaching us to believe it. The preaching of the Goſpell was before the writing of the Goſpell, the Divine Truth that diſperſed it ſelfe over the face of the whole earth, before it's Divinitie was compriſed within the Canon of the Scripture, was like that* Primæva Lux, *which the world received before the light was gathered into the body of the Sun: this body ſo glorious and comfortable is but the ſame light, which was before, we cannot make it another, though it be otherwiſe: And therefore though the Church and the Scripture, like the light that is concomitant and precedent to the Sun, be diſtinct in tearms, yet they are but one and the ſame; no*

man

man can ſee the Sun, but by it's own light; ſhut your eyes from this light, and you cannot behold the body of the Sun: Shut your eyes againſt one, and you are blind in both: he never had God to be his Father, who had not the Church to be his Mother. If you admit Sillogiſmes à priori, *you will meet with many paralogiſmes* à poſteriori *cry downe the Churches, Authoritie, and pull out the Scriptures efficacie, give but the Church the lie now and then, and you ſhall have enough will tell you the Scripture is falſe here and there; they who have ſet ſo little by the tradition of the Church, have ſet by halfe the Scriptures, and will at laſt throw all away: wherefore in a word, as to deny any part of the Scripture, were to open a vein, ſo to queſtion any thing which the Church propoſes, is to teare the ſeameleſſe Coat of Chriſt, and to pierce his body.*

King. My Lord, I ſee you are better provided with Arguments then I am with memorie, to run through the ſeries of your Diſcourſe; ſatisfie me but in one thing, and I ſhall ſoone yeild to all that you have ſaid, and that is concerning this Catholick Church you talke of, I know the creed tells us, that we muſt believe it, and Chriſt tells us, that we muſt hear it, but neither tell us, that that is the Church of *Rome.*

Marq. *Gratious Sir, the creed tells us, that it is the Catholick Church, and Saint* Paul *tells us in his epiſtle to the* Romans, *that their faith was ſpread abroad through the whole world.*

King. That was the Faith, which the *Romanes* then believed, which is nothing to the *Roman* Faith which is now believed.

Marq. *The* Roman *Faith then and now are the ſame.*

King. I deny that my Lord.

Marq. *When did they alter their Faith?*

King.

King. That requires a librarie: Neither is it requiſite, that I tell you the time when, if the envious man ſowes his tares, whilſt the husband-man was aſleep, and afterwards he awakes and ſees the tares, are they not tares, becauſe the husband-man knowes not when they were ſown?

Marq. *And if it pleaſe Your Majeſtie, in a thing that is ſo apparent, your ſimilitude holds good, but the differences between us and the Proteſtants are not ſo without diſpute, as that it is yet granted by the major part of Chriſtians, that they are errours which we believe contrary to your Tenents; and therefore the ſimilitude holds not, but I ſhall humbly intreat Your Majeſtie, to conſider the proofs, which the learned Cardinal* Peroone *hath made concerning this particular, in his anſwer to your Royall Father his Apologie to all Chriſtian Princes, where he proves, how that all the Tenents which are in controverſie now between you and us, were practiſed in the Church of Chriſt, within the firſt three hundred years; wherefore I think, it would be no injury to reaſon to require belief, that that which hath been ſo long continued in the Church, and ſo univerſally received, and no time can be ſet down, when thoſe Tenents or Ceremonies did ariſe, muſt needs be Catholick for time and place, and Apoſtolicall for inſtitution, though we have no warrant from the Scriptures, to believe them to be ſuch. For the Apoſtle Saint* Paul *commanded* Timothy *to keep faſt the things which he had delivered unto him, as well by word as by writ. Wherefore if we will believe no tradition, we may come at laſt to believe no writings.*

King. That was your owne fault, wherefore I blame your Church, for the way to make the Scriptures not believed, were to adde unto them new inventions, and ſay they were Scriptures.

Marq. *If the Church of Christ had so mean esteeme then, as amongst some she hath now, certainly the former books received into her Canon, would have been much prejudiced by the admittance of the latter; wherefore if the Church be questionable, then all is brought in question.*

King. My Lord, you have not satisfied me, where this Church is: and as concerning the Cardinals book, I have seen it, and have read a part of it, but doe not remember, neither doe I believe, that he hath prov'd that which you say.

Marq. *It may be the proofes were in that part of the book, which Your Majesty did not read: and as for my proving the* Roman *Church to be this Church, by which we should be all guided, I thus shall doe my endeavour: That Church whose Doctrine is most Catholick and universall, must be the Catholick Church: but the* Roman *Church is such.* Ergo.

King. My Lord, I deny your Minor, the *Romane* Church is not most universall; the *Grecian* Church is far more spreading; and if it were not, it were no Argument, for the Church of the *Mahumetanes*, is larger then both.

Marq. *First, This is no Argument, either for an* English *Man, or a* Protestant, *but for a* Grecian, *or* Mahumetane: *not for an* English *Man, because he received his Conversion from* Rome, *and therefore he in Reason should not look beyond* Rome, *or the Doctrine that* Rome *practised then, when they converted* England: *nor for a* Protestant, *because he is as far distant from the* Grecian *Church in matter of opinion, as from the* Romane; *and therefore he need not look for that which he hath no desire to find: besides, the* Greek *Church hath long agoe submitted to the Church of* Rome, *and there is no reason, that others should make Arguments for her, who are not of her, when she stands*

ſtands in no competition her ſelfe; beſides, there is not in any place wherever the Greek *Church is, or hath beene planted, where there are not* Roman *Catholicks; but there are diverſe Countreys in Chriſtendome, where there is not one Profeſſour of the* Greek *Church; neither is there a place in all the* Turks *Dominions, where there are not* Romane *Catholicks, nor in any part of the world, where there are not multitudes of* Romanes; *neither is there a* Proteſtant *Countrey in Chriſtendome, where there are not* Romane *Catholicks numberleſſe, but not a* Proteſtant *amongſt the Natives, neither of* Spaine *or* Italy. *Shew me but one* Proteſtant *Countrey in the world, who ever deſerted the* Romane *Faith, but they did it by Rebellion, except* England, *and there the King and the Biſhops were the principall reformers: (I pray God, they doe not both ſuffer for it.) Shew me but one reformed Church, that is of the opinion of another: aske an* Engliſh *Proteſtant, where was your Religion before* Luther? *and he will tell you of* Hus *and* Jerom *of* Prague: *ſearch for their Tenents, and you ſhall find them as far different from the* Engliſh Proteſtant, *as they are from one another; run to the* Waldenſes *for your Religions antiquity, and you ſhall find as much difference in their Articles, and ours, as can be between Churches that are moſt oppoſite. Come home to your owne Countrey, and derive your deſcent from* Wickliffe, *and ſearch for his Tenents in the booke of* Martyrs, *and you ſhall find them quite contrary to ours, neither amongſt any of your moderne* Proteſtants *ſhall you find any other agreement, but in this one thing, that they all proteſt againſt the* Pope. *Shew me but any* Proteſtant *Countrey in the world, where Reformation, as you call it, ever ſet her foot, where ſhe was not as well attended with ſacriledge, as uſher'd by Rebellion, and I ſhall lay my hand upon my mouth for ever.*

King. My Lord, my Lord, you are gone beyond the ſcope of your Argument, which required you to prove the *Romane* Church more Catholick then the Greek, which you have not done; you put me off with my being *Engliſh*, and not a *Grecian*, whereas when we ſpeak of the univerſality of a Church, I think that any man who is belonging to the univerſe, is *objectum rationis.* And if that be the manner of your Election, then I am ſure moſt voices muſt carry it: for your alleaged ſubmiſſion of the *Greek* Church unto the *Roman*, I believe it cannot be prov'd, but it may be the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, may ſubmit unto the Pope of *Rome*, and yet the *Greek* Church may not ſubmit unto the *Romane.*

Marq. *Sir, it is no diſhonour for the Sun to make its progreſs from Eaſt to Weſt, it is ſtill the ſame Sun, and the difference is onely in the ſhadowes, which are made to differ according to the varieties of ſhapes, that the ſeverall ſubſtances are of; Eaſt and Weſt are two diviſions, but the ſame day: neither can they be ſaid or imagined to be greater, or more extending one or other, and the one may have the benefit of the Suns light, though the other may have its glory; and I believe, no man of ſober judgment can ſay, that any Church in the world is more generally ſpread over the face of the whole world, or that her glory ſhines in any place more conſpicuouſly, then at this day in* Rome.

King. My Lord, if externall glory be the Sun-ſhine of the Goſpel, then the Church is there indeed; but if internall ſanctity, and inward holyneſſe be the Eſſences of a Church, then we may be as much to ſeek for ſuch a Church within the Wals of *Rome*, as any where elſe.

Marq. *Who ſhall be Judge of that? I pray obſerve the Injuſtice and Errours that will ariſe, if every man may be admitted*

admitted to be his owne judge; you of the Church of England *left your Mother the Church of* Rome, *and Mother to all the Churches round about; You forsook her, and set up a new Church of your own, Independent to her: there comes a new generation, and doth the like to you; and a third generation, that is likely to do the like to that; and the Church falls and falls, untill it falls to all the pieces of Independencie. It is a hard case for a part to fall away from the whole, and to be their owne judges. Why should not* Kent *fall away from* England, *aud be their owne judges, as well as* England *fall away from Christendome, and be their own judges? why should not a Parish in* Kent *fall away from the whole County, and be their owne judges? why should not one Family fall away from the whole Parish, and be their owne judges? why should not one man fall away in his opinion from that Family, and be his owne judge? If you grant one, you must grant all; and I feare me in doing one, you have done all. So that every man despiseth the Church, whilst he is a Church in himselfe; rayles against Popery, and is the greatest Pope himselfe, despiseth the Fathers, and will enthrone his own judgment above the wisdome of the ancient; refuseth Expositours, that he may have his own sence; and if he can start up but some new opinions, he thinks himselfe as worthy a member of Christianity, as if he were an Apostle to some new found land. Now Sir, though some do take the Church to be the Scriptures, yet the Scriptures cannot be the Church, because the Scriptures send us to the Church,* audi Ecclesiam, dic Ecclesiæ: *others take the Elect to be the Church, yet this cannot be, for we know not who are elect, and who are not, that which must be the Church, must be a visible, an eminent societie of men, to whose Authority in cases of appeale and matter of judgement, we are to acquiesce and subscribe. And I appeale to*

Your Royall heart, whether there be a Church in the world, whom in theſe reſpects we ought to reverence and eſteeme more then the Church of Rome; *and that the Church of* Rome *is externally glorious, it doth not follow, that therefore ſhe is not internally holy; for the Kings daughters clothing was of wrought gold, as well as ſhe was all glorious within; and though ſhe had never ſo many Divine graces within her, yet ſhe had honourable women without her, as her attendants: and for the queſtion, whether this inward glory is to be ſo much ſought for within the gates of* Rome, *is the queſtion, and not yet decided.*

King. My Lord, I'le deale as ingennouſly with you as I can. When the *Romane* Monarch ſtretch'd forth his arms from *Eaſt* to *Weſt*, he might make the Biſhops of *Romes* œcumenacy as large as was his Empire, and all the Churches in the world were bound to follow her Lawes and decretalls, becauſe God hath made ſuch Emperours nurſing Fathers of his Church, as it was propheſied by the Divine *Eſay*; alwayes provided, that the child be not pourtractured greater then the Nurſe, (as hath been obſerved by the pride of your Biſhops of *Rome,*) but when the ſeverall Kingdoms of Chriſtendome ſhook off the *Romane* Yoke; I ſee no reaſon why the Biſhop of *Rome* ſhould expect obedience from the Clergie of other Countries, any more then the Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury* ſhould expect obedience from the Clergie of other Kingdoms. And for your deriving your Authority from Saint *Peter*; I know no reaſon, why we may not as well derive our Authority from *Simon Zelotes*, or *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, or from *Philip*, of whoſe planting the Goſpell we have as good warrant, as you have for Saint *Peter* his planting the Goſpel in *Rome*. But, my Lord, I muſt tell you, that there are other

other Objections to be made againſt your Church, which more condemns her, if theſe were anſwered.

Marq. *May it pleaſe Your Majeſtie, to give me leave to ſpeak a word or two, to what I have ſaid, and then I ſhall humbly beg Your further Objections. As to that of the Chriſtian Kingdomes ſhaking off the* Roman *Yoke, and falling to pieces, which was ſo propheſied it ſhould, yet the Church ſhould not doe ſo, becauſe it is ſaid it ſhall remaine in unitie: and for Your Majeſties objection concerning* Simon Zelotes, Joſeph *of* Arimathea, *&c. It is anſwered, that there were two converſions, the firſt of the* Brittains, *the ſecond of the* Saxons; *we onely require this juſtice from you, as you are* Engliſh, *not* Welch-men, *for the Church of* England, *involves all the* Brittains *within her Communion: for the* Brittains *have not now any diſtinct Church from the Church of* England. *Now if Your Majeſtie pleaſe, I expect your further Objections.*

King. My Lord, I have not done with you yet: though particular Churches may fall away in their ſeverall reſpects of obedience to one ſupreme Authority, yet it follows not, that the Church ſhould be thereby divided, for as long as they agree in the unity of the ſame ſpirit, and the bond of peace, the Church is ſtill at unitie, as ſo many ſheaves of corne are not unbound, becauſe they are ſevered. Many ſheaves may belong to one field, to one man, and may be carryed to one barne, and be ſervient to the ſame table. Unity may conſiſt in this, as well as in being hudled up together in a rick with one cock-ſheave above the reſt. I have an hundred pieces in my pocket, I find them ſomething heavie, I divide the ſumme, halfe in one pocket, and halfe in another: and ſubdivide them afterwards in two ſeverall leſſer pockets; The moneys, is divided, but the ſumme is not

broke,

broke, the hundred pounds is as whole as when it was together, becauſe it belongs to the ſame man, and is in the ſame poſſeſſion; ſo though we divide our ſelves from *Rome*, if neither of us divide our ſelves from Chriſt, we agree in him, who is the Center of all unitie, though we differ in matter of depending upon one another. But my Lord of *Worceſter*, we are got into ſuch a large field of diſcourſe, that the greateſt Schollers of them all can ſooner ſhew us the way in, then out of it; therefore, before we goe too far, let us retire, leſt we loſe our ſelves; and therefore, I pray my Lord, ſatisfie me in theſe particulars: Why doe you leave out the ſecond Commandement, and cut another in two? why doe you with-hold the Cup from the Laytie? why have you ſeven Sacraments, when Chriſt inſtituted but two? why doe you abuſe the World with ſuch a fable as Purgatory, and make ignorant fooles believe, you can fiſh ſoules from thence with ſilver hookes? why doe you pray to Saints, and worſhip Images? Thoſe are the offences which are given by your Church of *Rome* unto the Church of Chriſt; of theſe things I would be ſatisfied.

Marq. *Sir, although the Church be undefiled, yet ſhe may not be ſpotleſſe, to ſeverall apprehenſions: For the Church is compared to the Moon, that is full of ſpots; but they are but ſpots of our fancying; though the Church be never ſo comly, yet ſhe is deſcribed unto us to have black eye-browes, which may to ſome be as great an occaſion of diſlike, as they are to others foyles, which ſet her off more lovely. We muſt not make our fancies, judgements of condemnation to her, with whom Chriſt ſo much was raviſhed. For Your Majeſties Objections, and firſt, as to that of leaving out the ſecond Commandment, and cutting another*

in

in two; I beſeech Your Majeſtie, who called them Commandments? who told you they were ten? who told you which were firſt, and ſecond? &c. *The Scripture onely called them* words: *thoſe words, but* theſe: *and theſe words were never divided in the Scriptures into ten Commandments, but two Tables; the Church did all this, and might as well have named them twenty as ten Commandments; that which Your Majeſtie calls the ſecond Commandment, is but the explanation of the firſt, and is not razed out of the Bible, but for brevitie ſake in the manualls it is left out, as the reſt of the Commandment is left out concerning the Sabbath, and others: wherefore the ſame Church which gave them their Name, their Number, and their Diſtinction, may in their breviats, leave out what ſhe deems to be but expoſition; and deliver what ſhe thinks for ſubſtance, without any ſuch heavie charge as being blottable out of the booke of life, for diminiſhing the word of God.*

For withholding the Cup from the Laytie, where did Chriſt either give, or command to be given, either the Bread or the Wine to any ſuch? Drink ye all of this: *but they were all Apoſtles to whom he ſaid ſo, there were neither Lay-men or women there: If the Church allowed them afterwards to receive it, either in one, or both kinds, they ought to be ſatisfied therewith accordingly, but not queſtion the Churches Actions. She that could alter the* Sabbath *into the Lords day, and change the dipping of the Baptiſed over head and eares in water, to a little ſprinkling upon the face, (by reaſon of ſome emergencies, and inconveniencies, occaſioned by the difference of Seaſons, and Countries) may, upon the like occaſion, accordingly diſpoſe of the manner of her Adminiſtration of her Sacraments. Neither was this done without great reaſon, the world had not wine*

in all her Countries, but it had bread. Wherefore it was thought for uniformity ſake (that they might not be unlike to one another, but all receive alike) that they ſhould onely receive the Bread, which was to be had in every place, and not the Cup, in regard that Wine was not every where to be had. I wonder that any body ſhould be ſo much offended at any ſuch thing, for Bread and Wine doe ſignifie Chriſt crucified; I appeal to common reaſon, if a dead body doth not repreſent a paſſion as much as if we ſaw the bloud lie by it. If you grant the Churches Power in other matters, and reſt ſatisfied therein, why do you boggle at this, eſpecially when any Prieſt, (where Wine is to be had) if you deſire it, he will give it you? But if upon every mans call the Church ſhould fall to reforming upon every ſeeming fault, which may be but ſuppoſed to be found, the people would never ſtop untill they had made ſuch a through Reformation in all parts, as they have done in the greateſt part of Germany, *where there is not a man to Preach, or hear the Goſpell, to eat the Bread, or drink the Wine: you never pickt ſo many holes in our Coates, as this licentiouſneſſe hath done in yours.*

For our ſeven Sacraments, ſhe that called the Articles of our Faith 12, *the* Beatitudes 8, *the* Graces 3, *the* Virtues 4, *called theſe* 7, *and might have called them* 17 *if ſhe had thought it meet. A Sacrament is nothing elſe but what is done with a holy mind, and why Sacrament, either in Name, or Number, ſhould be confin'd to Chriſts onely Inſtitution, I ſee no cauſe for it; If I can prove that God did inſtitute ſuch a thing in* Paradiſe, (*as he did Marriage*) *ſhall not I call that a Sacrament as well as what was inſtituted by Chriſt, when he was upon the Earth? If Chriſt inſtitutes the Order of giving, and receiving the holy Ghoſt, ſhall not I call this the Sacrament of Orders? If Chriſt in-*

joynes

joynes us all repentance, ſhall we not ſay repentance is a Sacrament? If Chriſt bleſſeth little children, and ſaith, Suffer them to come unto me, and forbid them not; *ſhall we not ſay that ſuch confirmation is a Sacrament? Truly I doe not underſtand their meaning; They have taken away five, which five, either by God, or Chriſt, or the holy Ghoſt, (who are all one) were inſtituted; and yet they ſay they are not Sacraments, becauſe they were not inſtituted by Chriſt: And the two that are left,* viz. *Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper; for the firſt, you hold it neceſſary to Salvation; and for the ſecond, you do not admit the reall preſence: ſo that of the two remaining, you have taken away the neceſsity of the one, and the reality of the other, ſo farwell all.*

Now for Purgatory, I do believe, we have as good ground for it out of this place of Scripture, viz. He ſhall be purged, yet ſo as if it were by fire: *as you can prove a Hell out of this place of Scripture*, He ſhall be caſt into utter darkneſſe, and into the lake that burneth with fire and brimſtone, where ſhall be weeping and gnaſhing of teeth. *Neither can you make more exceptions to our inference out of this place of Scripture, to prove Purgatory, then the Atheiſt (if wits may be permitted to roame in ſuch things, as theſe once ſetled, and believed generally, will find ground enough to quarrell at your burning lake; and the vaine Philoſopher, Contradictions enough, in the deſcription of the effects of thoſe helliſh Torments*, viz. *weeping and gnaſhing of teeth: the one having its procedure from heat, the other from cold, which are meer Contradictions, and therefore fabulous; take heed we doe not take away Hell, in removing of Purgatory. You ſee not, how your laughing at Purgatory hath cauſed ſuch laughing at Hell, and Devils; untill at laſt, you ſhall ſee them bid the Heavens come down, and pluck the Almighty out of his Throne: If a Text of*

Scripture with the Churches Expoſition be not ſufficient for a man to reſt, both his Science and Conſcience upon: I know not where it will find a reſting place, it may ſhoot at Randome, but never take ſo right an ayme; and for the ſilver hooke you talk'd of, I do not juſtifie the abuſe of any, I know there is a great difference betweene the Court of Rome, *and the Church of* Rome; *and if theſe Errours were in the Church it ſelfe, yet the tares muſt not be haſtily pluckt out of the field of the Church, leſt the wheat be pluckt up with it.*

Now for our praying to Saints, there is no body that prayes to any Saints, otherwiſe then as we on earth deſire the benefit of one anothers prayers. We do not believe that they can help us (of themſelves) or that they have power to forgive ſin, but we believe that they are nearer to God his favour, and more deare unto him: and therefore we believe, that he will heare them with, or for us, ſooner then he will hear us when we pray upon our own account: as we deſire the prayers of ſome good and holy man, (whom we believe to be ſo) hoping it will be a benefit unto us. All that can be ſaid againſt it, is, that they do not hear us. I will not trouble Your Majeſtie with the Schoolmens Speculum Creatoris, *but I ſhall deſire to be plaine: When there is* joy in heaven over every ſinner that repenteth; *do you think that the Saints which are there, are ignorant of the occaſion of that joy? or do they rejoyce at they know not what? If the Saints in heaven do crie, How long Lord, how long, holy and juſt, doſt thou not avenge our bloud upon them, which dwell upon the earth: if they know that their bloud is not yet avenged, do they not know when a ſinner is converted? and if they know the time of converſion, do they not know, the time of prayer? If* Abraham *knew that there were ſuch men as* Moſes *and the Prophets, who was dead ſo many hundred*

hundreds of years before their time, can we ſay, that they are ignorant? think ye, that thoſe miniſtring Angels who are called Intelligencers, give them no intelligence? or that they gather nothing of intelligence by looking him in the face, who is the fulneſſe of knowledge, and to all theſe the practice and opinion of ſo Catholick a Church; God can onely forgive ſins, Chriſt can onely mediate, but Saints, whether in heaven, or on the earth, may intercede for one another.

Laſtly, for our worſhipping of Images: confounded be all they that worſhipped them, for me, God is onely worthy to be worſhipped; but if I kneel before the Picture of my Saviour, *I worſhip him kneeling before his Picture; the worſhip is in the heart, and not in the knee, and where the true God is in the intention, there can be no Idolatrie.*

O Sir, Chriſtian Religion is not a Proteſtation, but a Goſpel: it would better conſiſt with unity, then oppoſition: we hold it a peece of popery to knock our owne breaſts with the fiſts of conſtitution, whilſt we hold it moſt Evangelicall, to knock at our neighbours with a Cunſtables ſtaffe: a pious care in a Mother Church, labours to educate her own daughter, and having fed her at her owne breaſts, all the gratitude ſhe returns her mother, is to call her whore, Antichriſt, Babylon, and all the ſpitefull and vile names that can be imagined; they forget that ſaying of the Apoſtle St. James: If any man among you ſeeme to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, that mans Religion is in vaine; Pure Religion, and undefiled before God, and the Father, is this: to viſit the fatherleſſe and widows, in their affliction, and to keep himſelfe unſpotted from the world. *What ſhould I ſay more, the Scriptures are made a noſe of wax, for every bold hand to wring it which way he pleaſeth, they are*

rejected by private men, by whole books, The Articles of our Creed are ſaid not to be of the Apoſtles framing, the Commandments not belonging to Chriſtians, impoſsible to be kept, the Sacraments denied; Charity not onely grown cold, but quite ſtarved, and they will be ſav'd by meanes quite contrary to what the Goſpel (which they ſeeme to profeſſe) ſets down, viz. *by Faith without good works, onely believe and thats enough, whereas the holy Apoſtle St.* James *tells us, that faith profiteth nothing without good works----*
" Here the Marqueſſe was going on, and His Majeſtie " interrupted him.

King. My Lord, you let a flood-gate of Arguments out, againſt my naked breaſt, yet it doth not beare me any thing backwards; you have ſpoken a great many things, that no way concerns Us, but ſuch as we find fault with as much as you; and other things, to which I could eaſily give anſwer, If I could take but ſome of that time and leaſure that you have taken to compoſe your Arguments. It is not onely the Picture of our *Saviour,* but the Pictures of *Saints* which you both worſhip and adore, and maintaine it to be lawfull; and not onely ſo, but the Picture of God the Father, like an old man, and many other things which I forbeare, becauſe I feare, you have done your ſelfe more hurt then me good, in depriving your ſelfe of the reſt, to which you are accuſtomed; for whilſt our Arguments do multiplie our time leſſens: to that of Saint *James,* where it is ſaid, that faith profiteth nothing without good works; I hope the Doctor here can tell you, that Saint *Paul* ſaith, that we are juſtified by Faith, and not by the works of the Law.

Marq. *Sir, I believe the Doctor will neither tell Your Majeſtie, nor me, that Faith can juſtifie without works.*

King

King. That queſtion the Doctor can ſoone decide, what ſay you to it Doctor? you muſt ſpeak now.

Doctor. If it may pleaſe Your Majeſtie, it would be as great a diſobedience to hold my peace, now I am commanded to ſpeak, as it would have been a preſumption in me to ſpeak before I was commanded; I am ſo far from thinking that either Faith, without good works, or that good works without Faith, can juſtifie: that I cannot believe that there is ſuch a thing as either. No more then I can imagine, that there may be a tree bearing fruit, without a root: or that the Sun can be up, before it be day: or that a fire can have no heat; for although it be poſſible, that a man may do ſome good without Faith, yet he cannot do good works without it; for though we may naturally incline to ſome goodneſſe, as flowers and plants naturally grow to perfection; Yet this good cannot be ſaid to be wrought by us, but by the hand of Faith; and Faith her ſelfe (where ſhe is truly ſo) can no more ſtand ſtill, then can the Sun in the Firmament, or refuſe to let her light ſo ſhine before men, that they may ſee her good works, then the ſame Sun can appeare in the ſame Firmament, and dart no beams. And whilſt Faith and good works ſtrive for the proprietie of Juſtification; I do believe, they both exclude a third, which hath more right to our Juſtification then either. For that which we call Juſtification by Faith, is not properly Juſtification; but onely an apprehenſion of it: as that which we call Juſtification, by good works, is not properly Juſtification, but onely a Declaration of it, to be ſo: *exempli gratia:* I receive a pardon, my hand that receiv's it, doth not juſtifie; 'tis put in execution, and read in open Court, all this did not procure it me. *Doubtleſſe there is a reward for the righteous, doubtleſſe there is a God that judgeth the Earth,* wherefore upon this ground of beliefe, *I work out* my Salvation as well as I can: and do all the good that lies in my power. *I do good works.* Doubtleſſe this man hath ſome reaſon for what he doth: it is becauſe he hath ſtore of Faith, which believes, there is a God, and that that God will accept of his endeavours, wherefore to him alone who hath given us Faith, and hath wrought all our good works in us can we properly attribute the tearme of Juſtification: *Juſtificatio apprehenſiva,* we may conceive and beare in our hearts: *Juſtificatio*

ficatio declarativa, we may ſhew with our hands: but *Juſtificatio Effectiva*, proper and effectuall Juſtification none can lay claim unto, but Chriſt alone, that as our ſins were imputed unto Chriſt, ſo his righteouſneſſe might be ours by imputation.

King. Doctor, I thank you, in this point I believe you have reconciled us both.

Doctor. May it pleaſe Your Majeſtie, if the venome were taken out, there is no wouud in the Churches body, but might ſoon be healed.

Marq. *Hereat the Marqueſſe ſomewhat earneſtly cryed, Hold Sir, You have ſaid well in one reſpect, but there are two wayes of Juſtification in us: and two without us: Chriſt is a cauſe of Juſtification by his grace and merits without us; and ſo we are juſtified by Baptiſme, and we are juſtified by the gifts of God in us*, viz. *Faith, Hope, and Charity. Whereupon the King ſpake as quickly.*

King. But my Lord, both Juſtifications come from Chriſt, according to your owne ſaying: That without us, by his grace and merit: that within us, by his gifts and favour; therefore Chriſt is all in all, in the matter of Juſtification; and therefore though there were a thouſand wayes, and meanes to our Juſtification, yet there is but one effectuall cauſe, and that is Chriſt.

Marq. *How is it then, that we are called by the Apoſtle*, Cooperarii Chriſto, *Fellow-workers together with Chriſt?*

King. The Doctor hath told you how already: If you lie wallowing in ſin, and Chriſt helps you out, your reaching of him your hand is a working together with Chriſt; Yet for all that, it cannot be ſaid, that you helped your ſelfe out of the ditch: for then there had been no need of Chriſt. Your apprehending the ſuccour that came unto you, no way attributes the God have mercie to your ſelfe: no more then the declaring your

your ſelfe to be alive by action; is the cauſe of ſetting you upon your leggs, ſo that we may divide this threefold Juſtification, as *Peter* divided his three Tabernacles, here is one for *Moſes*, and one for *Elias*: I pray let us have one for *Chriſt*, and let that be the chiefe.

Marq. *And Reaſon good.*

King. I wiſh that all Controverſies betwixt you and Us, were as well decided: I am fully ſatisfied in this point.

Doctor. May it pleaſe Your Majeſtie: A great many Controverſies between us and the Papiſts might be ſoon decided, if the Churches revenues (which were every where taken away, more or leſſe, where differences in Religion in ſeverall parts of the world, did ariſe in the Church) were not an obſtacle of the reunion; like the ſtone, which the Crab caſt into the Oyſter, which hindred it from ever ſhutting it ſelfe againe; like the diviſion, which happened between the *Greek* and *Latine* Church. *Photinus* intrudes himſelfe into the Patriarch-ſhip of *Conſtantinople* over the head of *Ignatius*, the lawfull Patriarch thereof; whom the Pope preſerved in his Communion, and then the difference of the Proceſſion of the holy Ghoſt, between thoſe two Churches, was fomented by the ſaid *Photinus*, leſt the wound ſhould heale too ſoon, and the patient ſhould not be held long enough in cure, for the benefit of the *Chyrurgion*. Sacriledge hath brought more diviſions then the nature of their cauſes have required: and the Univerſities play with edged tools, whilſt hungry ſtomacks run away with their meat; wherefore ſince Your Majeſtie was pleaſed to diſcharge the watch, that I had ſet before the dore of my lips: I ſhall make bold to put Your Majeſtie in mind of holding my Lord to the demand which Your Majeſtie once made unto his Lordſhip, concerning the true Church; for if once that Queſtion were throughly determined, all Controverſies not onely between Your Majeſtie and his Lordſhip, but alſo all the Controverſies that ever were ſtarted, would ſoon be decided at a ſhort race end; and without this, we take away the meanes of reconciliation. For I muſt confeſſe ingenuouſly (yet under the higheſt correction) that there is not a thing that I ever under-

ſtood leſſe, then that aſſertion, of the Scriptures being judge of Controverſies, though in ſome ſence I muſt, and will acknowledge it: but not as it is a book conſiſting of papers, words, and letters; for as we commonly ſay in matters of civill differences, the Law ſhall be the judge between us, we do not meane, that every man ſhall run unto the Law books, or that any Lawyer himſelfe ſhall ſearch his Law-caſes, and thereupon poſſeſſe himſelfe of any thing that is in queſtion between him and another, without a legall tryall and determination by lawfull Judges, conſtituted to that ſame purpoſe: In like manner, ſaving knowledge and Divine Truths are the portion, that all Gods children lay faſt claime unto: yet they muſt not be their own carvers, though it is their own meat that is before them, whilſt they have a mother at the table; They muſt not ſlight all Orders, Conſtitutions, Appeales, and Rules of Faith; ſaving knowledge, and Divine Truths, are not to be wreſted from the Scripture by private hands, for then the Scripture were of private interpretation: which is againſt the Apoſtles Rule. Neither are thoſe undefiled, incorruptible and immaculate inheritances, which are reſerved for us in heaven, to be conveighed unto us by any Privy-ſeales. For there is nothing more abſurd, to my underſtanding, then to ſay, that the thing conteſted (which is the true meaning of the Scriptures) ſhall be Judge of the Conteſtation: no way inferiour to that abſurditie, which would follow, which would be this, if we ſhould leave the deciding of the ſence of the words of the Law, to the preoccupated underſtanding of one of the Advocates; neither is this all the abſurditie that doth ariſe upon this ſuppoſition: for if you grant this to one, you muſt grant it to any one, and to every one: if there were but two, how will you reconcile them both? If you grant that this judicature muſt be in many, there are many manyes, which of the manyes will you have? decide but that, and you ſatisfie all. For if you make the Scripture the Judge of Controverſie, you make the reader Judge of the Scripture: as a man conſiſts of a ſoule and body, ſo the Scripture conſiſts of the letter and the ſence; if I make the dead letter my Judge, I am the greateſt, and ſimpleſt idolater in the world: it will tell me no more, then it told the *Indian* Emperour *Powhaton*, who asking the Jeſuite, how he knew all that to be true which he had told him

him, and the Jeſuite anſwering him, that Gods word did tell him ſo. The Emperour asked him, where it was? he ſhewed him his Bible. The Emperour, after that he had held it in his hands a pretty while, anſwered. It tells me nothing. But you will ſay, you can read, and ſo you will find the meaning out of the ſignificant Character; and when you have done, as you apprehend it, ſo it muſt be; and ſo the Scripture is nothing elſe but your meaning: wherefore neceſſitie requires an externall Judge, for determination of differences, beſides the Scriptures. And we can have no better recourſes to any, then to ſuch as the Scripture it ſelfe calls upon us to heare, which is the Church, which Church would be found out.

King. Doctor, Saint *John* in his firſt Epiſtle tells us, that the holy Scripture is that, to whoſe truth the Spirit beareth witneſſe. And *John* the Evangeliſt tells us, that the Scripture is that which gives a greater Teſtimonie of Chriſt, then *John* the Baptiſt. Saint *Luke* tells us, that if we believe not the Scripture, we would not believe though one were riſen from the dead: and Chriſt himſelfe, who raiſed men from death to life, tells us; they cannot believe his words, if they believe not in *Moſes* writings: Saint *Peter* tells us, that the holy Scripture is *ſurer then a voice from heaven:* Saint *Paul* tells us; that *it is lively in operation, and whereby the Spirits demonſtrates his power*; and that, *it is able to make a man wiſe to ſalvation*; *able to ſave our ſoules*; *and that it is ſufficient too) to make us believe in Chriſt, to life everlaſting*, John 20. As in every ſeed, there is a Spirit, which meeting with earth, heat, and moiſture, grows to perfection: ſo the ſeed of the word, wherin Gods holy Spirit being ſowen in the heart, inlivened by the heart of faith, and watered with the teares of repentance) ſoon fructifies without any further Circumſtance.

Doctor. It doth ſo, but Your Majeſtie preſuppoſes all this while, husband-men, and husbandry, barnes and threſhing floors,

winnowing and uniting these several grains into one loafe, before it can become childrens bread. All that Your Majestie hath said concerning the Scriptures sufficiencie, is true, provided, that those Scriptures be duly handled; for as the Law is sufficient to determine right, and keep all in peace and quietnesse, yet the execution of that sufficiencie, cannot he performed without Courts and Judges: so when we have granted the Scriptures to be all that the most reverend estimation can attribute unto them, yet Religion cannot be exercised, nor differences in Religion reconciled, without a Judge; For as Saint *Jerom* tells us, who was no great friend to Popes or Bishops: *Si non una, exors quædam, & imminens detur potestas, tot efficerentur in Ecclesia schismata quot Sacerdotes.* Wherefore I would faine find out that which the Scripture bids me heare, *Audi Ecclesiam*: I would faine referre my selfe to that to which the Scripture commands me to appeale, and tells me, that if I do not, I shall be a Heathen and a Publican, *Dic Ecclesiæ*: which Church Saint *Paul* in his first Epistle calls the pillar and foundation of Truth, of which the Prophet *Ezekiel* saith: *I will place my Sanctification in the midst of her for ever*: and the Prophet *Esay*, that the Lord would never forsake her, in whose light the people should walke, and Kings in the brightnesse of her Orient; Against which our *Saviour* saith: *The gates of Hell shall not prevaile*: with whom our *Saviour* saith, *He would be alwayes unto the end of the world.* And from whom the Spirit of Truth should never depart. For although the *Psalmist* tells us, that the word of the Lord is clear, inlightning the eyes, yet the same Prophet said to God: *Enlighten mine eyes, that I may see the marvels of thy Law*: And Saint *John* tells us, that the booke of God hath seven Seals, and it was not every one that was thought worthy to open it, onely the lambe. The Disciples had been ignorant, if *Jesus* had not opened the Scriptures unto them. The *Eunuch* could not understand them without an Interpreter; and Saint *Peter* tells us, that the Scripture is not of private Interpretation: and that in his brother *Pauls* Epistles there are many things hard to be understood, which ignorant and light-headed-men wrest to their owne perdition. Wherefore though as Saint *Chrysostom* saith: *Omnia clara sunt & plana ex scripturis divinis: quæcunque necessaria sunt, manifesta sunt*: yet no man ever

ever hath yet defined what are neceſſary, and what not. What points are fundamentall, and what are not fundamentall. Neceſſary to Salvation is one thing, and neceſſary for knowledge, as an improvement of our faith, is another thing: for the firſt, if a man keeps the Commandments, and believes all the Articles of the Creed, he may be ſaved, though he never read a word of Scripture; but much more aſſuredly if he meditates upon Gods word with the *Pſalmiſt* day and night. But if he meanes to walk by the rule of Gods word, and to ſearch the Scriptures, he muſt lay hold upon the meanes that God hath ordained, whereby he may attaine unto the true underſtanding of them; for as Saint *Paul* ſaith: *God hath placed in the Church Apoſtles, Prophets, Evangeliſts, Paſtors and Doctors,* to the end we ſhould be no more little children, blown about with every wind of Doctrine; therefore it is not for babes in underſtanding to take upon them to underſtand thoſe things, wherein ſo great a Prophet as the Prophet *David* confeſſed the darkneſſe of his owne ignorance. And though it be true, the Scripture is a river through which a lambe may wade, and an Elephant may ſwim, yet it is to be ſuppoſed and underſtood, that the lambe muſt wade but onely through, where the river is foordable; It doth not ſuppoſe the river to be all alike in depth, for ſuch a river was never heard of; but there may be places in the river, where the lambe may ſwim as well as the Elephant, otherwiſe it is impoſſible that an Elephant ſhould ſwim in the ſame depth, where a lambe may wade, though in the ſame river he may; neither is it the meaning of that place, that the child of God may wade through the Scripture without directions, help, or Judges, but that the meanneſt capacitie, qualified with a harmeleſſe innocence, and deſirous to wade through that river of living waters to eternall life, may find ſo much of Comfort, and heavenly knowledge there, eaſily to be obtained, that he may eaſily wade through to his eternall Salvation; and that there are alſo places in the ſame river, wherein the higheſt ſpeculations may plunge themſelves, in the deep myſteries or God. Wherefore with pardon crav'd for my preſumption, in holding Your Majeſtie in ſo tedious a diſcourſe, as alſo, for my boldneſſe in obtruding my opinion, which is except (as incomparable *Hooker* in his Eccleſiaſticall pollicy hath well obſerved) the Churches Au-

thority be required herein, as neceſſary hereunto we ſhall be ſo far from agreeing upon the true meaning of the Scripture, that the outward letter ſealed with the inward witneſſe of the Spirit (being all hereticks have quoted Scripture and pretended Spirit) will not be a warrant ſufficient enough, for any private man to judge ſo much as the Scripture to be Scripture: or the Goſpell it ſelfe, to be the Goſpell of Chriſt: This Church being found out, and her Authority allowed of, all controverſies would be ſoone decided, and although we allow the Scripture to be the lock upon the door, which is Chriſt, yet we muſt allow the Church to be the Key, that muſt open it; as Saint *Ambroſe* in his 38. Sermons calls the agreement of the Apoſtles in the Articles of our beliefe, *Clavis Scripturæ*, one of whoſe Articles is, I believe the holy Catholick Church. As the Lion wants neither ſtrength, nor courage, nor power, nor weapons, to ſeize upon his prey, yet he wants a noſe to find it out: wherefore by naturall inſtinct, he takes to his aſſiſtance, the little Jack-call, a quick ſented beaſt, who runs before the Lion, and having found out the prey, in his language gives the Lion notice of it, who ſoberly (untill ſuch time as he fixes his eyes upon the bootie) makes his advance, but once comming within view of it, with a more ſpeed then the ſwifteſt running can make, he jumps upon it, and ſeizes it. Now to apply this to our purpoſe.

Chriſt crucified is the main ſubſtance of the Goſpell, according to the Apoſtles ſaying, *I deſire to know nothing, but Jeſus, and him crucified*; This crucified Chriſt is the nouriſhment of our ſoules, according to our *Saviours* own words: *Ubi Cadaver, ibi aquilæ*; Thereby drawing his Diſciples from the curious ſpeculation of his body glorified, to the profitable meditation of his body crucified: It is the prey of the Elect: the dead Carkaſſe feedeth the Eagles, Chriſt crucified nouriſheth his Saints: according to Saint *Johns* ſaying, *except we eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his bloud, we have no life in us*; him we muſt maſtigate, and chew by faith: traject, and convey him into our hearts as nutriment, by meditation: and digeſt him by Coalition, whereby we grow one with Chriſt, and Chriſt becomes one with us, according to that ſaying of *Tertullian, Auditu devorandus eſt, intellectu ruminandus, fide digerendus.*

Now

Now for the true understanding of the Scriptures, which is no other thing, then the finding out of *Jesus*, and him crucified, who is the very life of the Scriptures; which body of Divinity, is nourished with no other food, and all its veines fil'd with no other bloud: though this heavenly food (the Scripture) have neither force nor power to seize upon its prey, but is endued with a lively spirit, able to overcome the greatest ignorance, yet there is a quick sented assistant called *Ecclesia*, or Church, which is derived from a *verbe*, which signifies to call, which must be the Jack-call, to which this powerfull seeker after this prey must joyne it selfe, or else it will never be able to find it out; and when we are called, we must go soberly to work, untill by this means we have attained unto the true understanding and sight thereof, and then, let the Lion, like the Eagle, *Maher-shalal hashbaz* (as the Prophet *Esay cap.* 8. *v.* 3. tells us,) *make hast to the prey, make speed to the spoile.* Saint *Paul* confirmes the use of this Etymologie writing to the *Corinthians, viz.* To the Saints called: and the *Ephesians cap.* 4. he tells us, if ye would be in *one body, and in one spirit*, and of one mind, you must be *as you are called in our hope of your vocation*: and in his Epistle of the *Colossians cap.* 3. he tells us, that if we will have *the peace of Christ* to rule in our hearts, that is it *by which we are called in one selfe body*, where we must allow a constitution or Society of men called to that purpose, and whose calling it is to procure unto us this peace and unitie in the Church, or we shall never find it. Thus when dissention arose between *Paul* and *Barnabas* concerning Circumcision, their disputations could effect nothing but heat, untill the Apostles and Elders met together, and determined the matter: there must be a society of men that can say, *Bene visum fuit nobis & Spiritui sancto* or else matters of that nature will never be determined: which societie is there called the Church, which Church we are to find.

King. I pray, my Lord, what doe you meane by the holy Catholick Church, doe you meane the Church of *Rome?*

Marq. *I doe so.*

King. My thinks it should be inconsistent with it, to be both universall, and particular.

Marq.

Marq. *No more then it is inconſiſtent, for the Generall of Your Army to be Generall of all Your Officers and Souldiers, and yet a particular man. By the word* Roman, *we intend not the particular Church of* Rome, *but all the Churches which adhere and are joyned in Communion with the* Roman *Church, as by the Jewiſh Church, was not onely meant the Church of* Judah *onely, but of all the other Tribes which had Communion with her; the word Catholick is taken in three ſeverall ſences, formally, caſually, and participatively: In the firſt ſence, the Societie of all the true particular Churches, united in one ſelfe-ſame Communion, is called Catholick; Caſually, the* Roman *Church is called Catholick, for as much as ſhe infuſeth univerſalitie into all the whole body of the Catholick Church; wherefore being a Center and beginning of Eccleſiaſticall Communion, infuſing unitie, which is the form of univerſalitie, into the Catholick Church, ſhe may be called Catholick: Participatively, becauſe particular Churches agree, and participate in Doctrine and Communion with the Catholick.*

King. You have ſatisfied me why the Church of *Rome* (in your ſence) may be called Catholick, but you have not yet ſatisfied me, why other Churches may not be called (caſually) as much Catholick as ſhe: being the *Greek* Church hath infuſed as much univerſalitie into the whole body of the Catholick Church as ſhe did, and was both center and circumference, as much as ever ſhe was.

Marq. *Sir, as to this point, I ſhall refer your Majeſtie to the learned reply, that the profound Card.* Peroon, *ſo reſpectfully and learnedly made to Your royall Father his Apologie, wherein this point is largely and (to my apprehenſion) fully anſwered. But will Your Majeſtie either give or take,*

take, either let me ſhew you this Church, or elſe doe Your Majeſtie ſhew it me.

King. My Lord, if you can ſhew it me, I ſhall not ſhut mine eyes againſt it; But at this time, truly my Lord, I can hardly hold them open. My Lord, I pray will you ſet downe your mind in writing, and I will promiſe you it ſhall want no animadverſion, and that I will give you my clear opinion concerning it.

Marq. *O Sir!* Literæ ſcriptæ manent; *I doe not like, that what I ſpeak here to your Majeſtie, I can promiſe my ſelfe, ſo much from your goodneſſe, that no bad Conſtruction ſhall be made of what I ſpeak. But if my writing ſhould come into other folks hands, I may juſtly fear their comments: wherefore I deſire to be excuſed.*

King. My Lord, I hold it more convenient ſo to doe: I will promiſe you, that I will let no eyes but mine owne view your Paper: and I will returne it to you againe by the Doctor.

Marq. *Upon that Condition I am contented: I have one requeſt more unto your Majeſtie: that You would make one Prayer to God, to direct You in the right way: and that You would lay aſide all prejudice, and ſelfe-intereſt, and that You will not ſo much fear the Subject, as the Superiour, who is over all, and then You cannot doe amiſſe.*

King. My Lord, all this ſhall be done, by the Grace of God.

Whereupon the Marqueſſe called upon me to help him, ſo that he might kneel: and being upon his knees, he deſired to kiſſe His Majeſties hand, which he did, ſaying:

Sir, I have not a thought in my heart, that tends not to the ſervice of my God, and you: and if I could have reſiſted

this motion of his Spirit, I had deſiſted long ago, but I could not: wherefore on both my knees, I pray to his Divine Majeſtie, that he will not be wanting to his owne Ordinance, but will direct Your underſtanding to thoſe things, which ſhall make You a happy King upon Earth, and a Saint in Heaven; "*And thereupon he fell a weeping, bidding me* "*to light His Majeſtie to His Chamber. As the King was* "*going, he ſaid unto the Marqueſſe:* My Lord, it is great pittie, that you ſhould be in the wrong: "*Whereat the Marqueſſe ſoone replyed: It is greater pittie, that You ſhould not be in the right.* "*The King ſaid:* God direct us both: *The Marqueſſe ſaid: Amen, Amen, I pray God.* "*Thus they both parted: and (as I was lighting His Ma-* "*jeſtie to His Chamber,) His Majeſtie told me, that he did* "*not think to have found the old man ſo ready at it, and* "*that he believed, he was a long time putting on his ar-* "*mour: yet it was hardly proofe. To which I made an-* "*ſwer, that I believe, his Lordſhip had more reaſon to* "*wonder, how His Majeſtie (ſo unprepared) could with-* "*ſtand the on-ſet. The King (being brought to His door,)* "*commanded me, that before I brought him his Lordſhips* "*Paper, I ſhould peruſe it, and give him my opinion of it.* "*Which I promiſed to obey, and ſo returned to the Mar-* "*queſſe, whom I found in the dark upon his knees, whom I* "*did not diſturbe; but when he roſe, he ſaid unto me: Do-* "*ctor, I will tell you what I was doing, I was giving God thanks, that he had preſerved the uſe of my memory for ſo good a work, and imploring a bleſſing upon my endeavours.* "*To which I made anſwer: My Lord, no queſtion but you* "*think it a good work, or elſe you would not implore Gods* "*bleſſing upon it. Whereupon my Lord ſaid: Ah! Doctor, I would to God you thought ſo too:* "*And waiting upon him* "*into his Chamber, he further ſaid unto me: Doctor* Bayly,

you

you know I am obliged not to ſpeak unto you in this nature, yet I hope I may ſay thus much unto you, without any breach of promiſe, you may be an Inſtrument of the greateſt good that ever befell this Nation. I ſay no more: Good night to you.

The third day after, he gave me this Paper to deliver unto His Majeſtie, which I did.

The Marqueſſe his Paper to the King.

IT muſt be granted by all, that there muſt be (alwayes) in the world, one holy, Catholick, and Apoſtolique Church: one, that it may be uniforme: holy, that it may be certaine: Catholick, that it may be knowne: and Apoſtolick, that it may ſucceed: this Church muſt be either the Romane, *or the* Proteſtant, *or elſe ſome other that is oppoſite to both. It cannot be any Church which is oppoſite to both: becauſe the Church of* England *did not (when ſhe ſeparated from the* Romane) *joyn her ſelfe to any: not to the* Grecian: *for that holds as many Doctrines contrary to the Church of* England, *as doth the* Roman; *nor to any elſe, becauſe ſhe agrees with none, no reformed Church under the Sun, that is, or ever was, hath the ſame articles of beliefe, as hath the Church of* England. *And from any other Church, beſides the* Romane, *ſhe never had a being: and with any other Church beſides the* Romane, *ſhe never had Communion; She cannot be that one, becauſe ſhe is but one: nor Catholick, becauſe ſhe agrees not with any: nor Apoſtolick, becauſe ſhe hath acknowledged ſuch a fine and recovery, that has quite cut off the entaile which would have (otherwiſe) deſcended unto her from the Apoſtles; neither can ſhe be holy, becauſe ſhe is none of all the other three. Now if theſe Attributes cannot belong unto the* Proteſtant

Religion, and do (clearly) belong unto the Roman, *then is the Church of* Rome, *the Catholick Church. And that it doth, I ſhall prove it by the marks, which God Almighty hath given us, whereby we ſhould know her.*

And the firſt is Univerſality: All Nations ſhall flow unto her, Eſa. 2. 2. *And the Pſalmiſt:* The heathen ſhall be thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt part of the Earth for thy poſſeſſion, Pſal. 2. 2. *And our Saviour Matth.* 20.14. This Goſpell of the Kingdome ſhall be preached in all the world, as a witneſſe to all Nations, *&c. Now I confeſſe, that this glory is belonging to all Profeſſors of the Chriſtian Religion: yet amongſt all thoſe, who do profeſſe the name of Chriſt, I believe, Your Majeſtie will conſent with me herein, that the* Romane *Church hath this forme of univerſality, not onely above all different and diſtinct Profeſſors of Religion, but alſo beyond all Religions of the world, Turkes or Heathens: and that there is no place in the world, where there are not* Romane *Catholicks; which is manifeſtly wanting to all other Religions, whatſoever: Now I hope Your Majeſtie cannot ſay ſo of any* Proteſtant *Religion: neither that Your Majeſtie will call all thoſe who proteſt againſt the Church of* Rome, *otherwiſe then* Proteſtants: *but not* Proteſtant *Catholicks, or Catholicks of the* Proteſtant *Religion, being they are not religated within the ſame Communion, and fellowſhips: for then Religion would conſiſt in proteſtation rather then unity; in Nations falling off from one another, rather then all Nations flowing to one another: neither is it a Conſideration altogether invalid, that the Church of* Rome *hath kept poſſeſſion of the name; all along other reformed Churches, leaving her in poſſeſſion of the name, and taking unto themſelves new names according to their ſeverall founders: except the Church of* England, *(who is now her ſelfe become*

come like a Chapter that is full of nothing elſe) whoſe founder was ſuch a one, whoſe name it may be they were unwilling to owne.

For antiquity, if we ſhould inquire after the old paths, which is the good way, and walke therein; *as the Prophet* Jeremiah *adviſeth us: if we ſhould take our Saviours rule,* Ab initio autem, non fuit ſic: *if we ſhould obſerve his ſaying, how the* good ſeed *was firſt ſowed, and then the* tares: *If we ſhould* conſider the pit from whence we were dug, and the rock from whence we were hewen, *we ſhall find antiquity more applicatory to the Church of* Rome, *then any* Proteſtant *Church. But you will ſay, your Religion is as ancient as ours; having its procedure from Chriſt, and his Apoſtles: ſo ſay the* Lutheran Proteſtants, *with their Doctrine of Conſubſtantiation: and many other ſorts of* Proteſtants, *having other Tenents, altogether contrary to what you hold: how ſhall we reconcile you? ſo ſay all hereticks that ever were, how ſhall we confute them? a part to ſet up themſelves againſt the whole; and by the power of the ſword, to make themſelves Judges in their owne cauſes, is dealing, that were it your caſe, I am ſure you would think it very hard, I wiſh you may never find it ſo.*

For Viſibility: Our Saviour compares his Church to a Citie placed on a hill, *according unto the Prophet* Davids *Propheſie,* a Tabernacle in the Sun: *It is likewiſe compared unto* a candle in a candle-ſtick: not under a buſhell: *and ſaith our Saviour,* If they ſhall ſay unto you, behold, he is in the deſart, go ye not forth; Behold, he is in ſecret places, believe it not; *forewarning us againſt obſcure and inviſible Congregations: Now I beſeech Your Majeſtie, whether ſhould I betake my ſelfe, to a Church that was alwayes viſible, and gloriouſly eminent; or to a* Proteſtant

Church that was never eminent, and for the moſt part inviſible; ſhrowding their defection, under an Apoſtolicall Expreſſion, of a woman *in the Revelation,* who fled into the wilderneſſe for a thouſand years? *as if an allegory, could wipe out ſo many clear texts of Scripture, as are ſet down by our Saviour, and the Prophets, concerning the Churches inviſibility? And I could not find any Church in the world to whom that Propheſie of* Eſay *might more fitly appertain, then to the Church of* Rome: I have ſet watch-men upon the walls, which ſhall never hold their peace day nor night, *which I am ſure no* Proteſtant *Church can apply to her ſelfe.*

It is not enough to ſay, I maintaine the ſame Faith and Religion which the Apoſtles taught, and therefore, I am of the true Church, ancient, and viſible enough; becauſe (as I have ſaid before) every heretick will ſay as much: but if you cannot by theſe marks of the Church, (ſet down in Scripture) clear your ſelves to be the true Church, you vainly appeale to the Scriptures ſiding with you in any particular point: for what can be more abſurd, then to appeale from Scripture, (ſetting things down clearly) unto Scripture ſetting down things more obſcurely? There is no particular point of Doctrine in the holy Scripture ſo manifeſtly ſet downe, as that concerning the Church, and the Markes thereof: nothing ſet down more copious and perſpicuous then the viſibility, perpetuitie, and amplitude of the Church.

So that Saint Auguſtin *did not ſtick to ſay, that the Scriptures were more clear about the Church, then they were about Chriſt. Let him anſwer for it. He ſaid ſo in his book,* de unitate Eccleſiæ, *and this (he ſaid) was the reaſon: becauſe, God (in his wiſdome) would have the Church to be deſcribed without any ambiguity, that all Controverſies*

ſies about the Church may be clearly decided: whereby queſtions about particular Doctrines, may find determinations in her judgement: and that Viſibility might ſhew the way unto the moſt rude and ignorant: and I know not any Church, to whom it may more juſtly be attributed, then to the Church of Rome: *whoſe Faith (as in the beginning was ſpread through the whole world) ſo (all along) and at this day, it is generally known among all nations. Next to this, I prove the Catholick Church to be the* Romane; *becauſe, a lawfull ſucceſſion of Paſtors is required in every true Church, according to the Prophet* Eſay *his Prophecie concerning her,* viz. My Spirit which is upon thee, and the words which I have put into thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeeds ſeed, from henceforth, for ever; *This ſucceſſion I can find onely in the Church of* Rome: *This ſucceſſion they onely can prove; none elſe offering to go about it. This ſucceſſion Saint* Auguſtin *ſayes, kept him in that Church,* viz. *a ſucceſſion of Prieſts, from the very ſeat of* Peter *the Apoſtle, to the preſent Biſhop of his time. And* Optatus Milevitanus *reckons all the* Romane *Biſhops from Saint* Peter *to* Syricius, *who then was Pope: and by this, he ſhewed and made it his Argument, that the true Church was not with the* Donatiſts: *bidding them, to ſhew the Originall of their Chayre; this no* Proteſtant *did, or ever can doe: The* Romane *Church gave the* Engliſh *Biſhops Commiſſion to preach the Doctrine of Chriſt, as they have delivered it unto them; but they never gave them any Commiſſion to preach againſt her Religion: which Biſhops being turned out, for obſerving the* depoſitum *(wherewith they were inſtructed) and new Biſhops choſen in their room (by her, who not contenting her ſelfe with being a nurſing mother thereof, muſt*

needs

needs be head of the child: and moderatrix in the ſame Church, wherein by the Apoſtles precept ſhe is forbidden to ſpeak) the ſucceſſion was broke off: the branch cut off from the body, becoming no part of the tree, fit for nothing but to be chopt into ſmaller pieces, and ſo fitted for the fire; this proofe of ſucceſſion the Biſhops of England, *thought ſo neceſſary, for proving their Church to be the true Church, that they affirmed themſelves to be conſecrated by Catholick Biſhops, their Predeceſſors, which (never proved) argues the interruption, and affirming it, ſhews how that (in their owne opinion the ſucceſſion could not hold in the inferiour Miniſters (as indeed it cannot) for as there is a continued ſupply of Embaſſadours in all places, yet the ſucceſſion is in the royall race: ſo though all vacancies are repleniſhed by Miniſters of the Goſpel, yet the ſucceſſion of the Authority was in the Biſhops, as deſcended (to them) from the Apoſtles, according to our Saviours rule*: I will be with you alwayes unto the end of the world; *Which Affirmation of theirs, argues that their calling is ſufficient without it: and in that they would faine derive it from the Church of* Rome, *it argues, that that is the true Church: and yet they would forſake her, ſuppoſing her to have errors, when that Reformation it ſelfe was but a ſuppoſition; for ſeeing they hold that their Church may erre, they can be certain of nothing: and whilſt (for errors ſake) they forſake the Church of* Rome, *the Church of* England *(in forſaking her) may be in the greateſt error of all: where there is neither Succeſſion, nor aſſurance, I muſt leave her to her ſelfe, and your Majeſtie to judge.*

Next: I prove the Romane *Church, to be the true Church, by her unity in Doctrine: for ſo the Apoſtle* Paul *requires all the Churches children to be* of one mind. *viz.* I beſeech you, that all ſpeak one thing; Be ye knit together

gether in one mind, and one Judgement, 1 *Cor.* 1. Endeavouring to keep the unitie of the Spirit in the bond of peace, *Epheſ.* 4. 3. The multitude of them that believed, were of one heart, and of one ſoul, *Act.* 4. 32. Continue in one Spirit and one mind, of one accord and one judgement, *Phil.* 1. 27. *Phil.* 2. 2. *So our Saviour prayeth that* they may be one; *So Joſeph forewarned his brethren, that* they ſhould not fall out by the way, *knowing that whilſt they were with him, he could order them: when they came to their father, he could order them: but having no head, they ſhould be apt to be diſſentious. This Unity I find no where but in the Church of* Rome: *agreeing in all things, which the Church of* Rome *hath determined for Doctrine, whereas the* Proteſtant *Doctrine, like the hereſie of* Simon Magus, *divided it ſelfe into ſeverall Sects, and to that of the* Donatiſts *which were cut into ſmall threds, in ſo much, that among the many Religions which are lately ſprung up, and the ſub, ſub, ſub-diviſions under them: each one (pretending to be the true* Proteſtant*) excluding the other: and all of them together, no more likely to be bound up in the bond of peace, then a bundle of thornes, can expect binding with a rope of ſand; In vaine is their excuſe, if non-diſagreement in fundameatalls: for they diſ-agree amongſt themſelves about the Sacrament: for the* Lutherans *hold Conſubſtantiation: but the Church of* England *no ſuch matter.*

Some, that Chriſt deſcended into hell: others not. The Church of England *maintain their King to be the head of the Church: The* Helvetians *will acknowledge no ſuch matter: the* Presbyterians *will acknowledge no ſuch matter; the* Independent *will acknowledge no ſuch matter: Concerning the Government of the Church by Biſhops, ſome* Proteſtants *maintaine it to be* Jure Divino: *others,*

to be Jure Eccleſiaſtico, *others no ſuch matter. Some think that the* Engliſh *tranſlations of the Bible in ſome places takes away, in other places addes, and other-ſome places changes the meaning of the holy Ghoſt, and ſome think it no ſuch matter, or elſe the Biſhops would not have recommended it unto the people. Laſtly, they are ſo far from agreeing about the true meaning of the word of God, that they cannot agree upon what is the word of God: For* Lutherans, *deny the ſecond Epiſtle of Saint* Peter, *the ſecond and third Epiſtle of Saint* John: *the Epiſtle to the* Hebr. *the Epiſtle of Saint* James, *and Saint* Jude, *and the Revelation; The* Calviniſts *and the Church of* England, *no ſuch matter, they allow them. And I believe that theſe are fundamentalls; If they cannot agree upon their Principalls, how ſhall they agree upon the deductions thence? If theſe be not fundamentall points, how come* Proteſtants, *to fight againſt* Proteſtants, *for the* Proteſtants *Religion?*

Lincol. min. to K. James, pag. 11. 13.

Chem. Ex. Contr. Trid. part. 1. pag. 55. *Alſo:* Eucher. p. 63.

The diſagreement is not ſo amongſt the Romane *Catholicks: for all points of the* Romane *Religion, that have been defined by the Church, in a generall Councell, are agreed upon exactly, by all nations, tongues and people,* uibicunque terrarum: *but in thoſe points which are not determined by the Church, the Church leaves every man to abound in his owne ſenſe; and therefore all the heat that is either between the* Thomiſts *and the* Scoliſts: *the* Dominicans, *and the* Jeſuits: *either concerning the Conception of our bleſſed* Lady, *or the concurrence of Grace, and free-will,* &c. *being points, wherein the Church hath not interpoſed her decrees, is no more prejudicall or objectionall againſt the Church of* Romes *Unitie, then the diſputations in the Schools of our Univerſities are prejudiciall to the* 39. *Articles of the Church of* England. *But in each*

ſeverall

ſeverall Proteſtant *Dominion there are certain ſeverall Articles of beliefe, belonging to ſeverall* Proteſtant *Dominions, in which ſeverall agreements, not any one, agrees with any of all the reſt; neither is there any poſsibility they ſhould: being there is no means acknowledged, nor power ordained, whereby they ſhould be gathered together in one councell, whereby they might be of one heart, and of one ſoule: neither is there this Unitie in any one particular Dominion: as is in the Dominion of the* Roman *Church; for they are all in pieces amongſt themſelves, even in their owne ſeverall Dominions, practiſing diſobedience to their Superiours, they teach it to their Inferiours.*

The greateſt Unitie the Proteſtants *have, is not in believing, but in not believing: in knowing, rather what they are againſt, then what they are for; not ſo much in knowing what they would have, as in knowing what they would not have. But let theſe negative Religions take heed they meet not with a negative Salvation.*

Neither can the Converſion of Nations *be attributed to any other Church then to the* Roman, *which is another mark of the true Church, according to the Propheſies of Eſay cap.* 49. 23. Kings ſhall be thy nurſing fathers, and Queens thy nurſing mothers. *And Eſay* 60. 16. Thou ſhalt ſuck the milk of the Gentiles, and the breaſts of Kings ſhall miniſter unto thee: *And Eſay* 60. 10. And thy Gates ſhall be continually open, that men may bring to thee the riches of the Gentiles, and that their Kings may be brought. And the Iles ſhall doe thee ſervice. *And the Prophet David,* I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion, *&c. Now no* Proteſtant *Church ever converted any one Nation, Kingdome or People. Many* Proteſtant *people have fallen away from the*

Church of Rome, *but this cannot be called converſion, but rather perverſion: for the* Romane *Church may juſtly ſay of ſuch, theſe have not converted Nations from paganiſme to Chriſtianity, which is the mark of the true Church:* Theſe are they, which went forth from us, 1 *Joh.* 2.19. Certaine that went forth from us, *Act.* 15. 14. Theſe are certaine men who riſe out of our ſelves, ſpeaking perverſe things, *Act.* 20.30. Theſe were they who ſeparated themſelves, *Jude* 19. *which are marks of falſe and hereticall Churches. But the* Romane *Church I find ſtretching forth her armes, from* Eaſt *to* Weſt, *receiving and imbracing all within her Communion; For the firſt three hundred years, the Church grew down-ward, like a ſtrong building, whoſe foundations are firſt laid in the earth, whoſe ſtones are knit together in Unity by the morter that was tempered with the blood of her ten Perſecutions. Afterwards this building, haſting upwards,* Conſtantine the great Emperour, ſubmitting his neck unto the yoke of Chriſt, ſubdued all Chriſtian Churches to Pope *Sylveſter*, then Pope of *Rome*, from which time to theſe our dayes the Pope and his Clergy hath poſſeſſed the outward and viſible Church *as is confeſſed by* Napier, *a learned* Proteſtant *in his treatiſe upon the* Revelation *pag.* 145. *and all along hath added Kingdomes upon Kingdoms to her Communion: untill ſhe had incorporated into her ſelfe, not onely* Europe, *but* Aſia, Africa *and* America: *as* Simon Lythus, *a Proteſtant writer, affirmeth,* viz. The *Jeſuits* have filled *Aſia, Africa* and *America* with their Idols *(as he calls them) for the late Converſions of the* Eaſt *and* Weſt-Indies *by the* Romans, *if you read* Joan. Petrus Maffeus Hiſt. Indicarum, Joſ. Acoſta de natur. novi orbis: *You ſhall find that no Church in the world hath ever ſpread ſo farre and wide, as the*

Church

Church of Rome. *Wherefore I hope in this reſpect (alſo) I may ſafely conclude that the Church of* Rome *moſt juſtly deſerves to be called the Catholick Church.*

Neither is it a vainer thing, to ſay, that the Pope of Rome *cannot be head of the Church, becauſe Chriſt himſelfe is head thereof; then it is for a man to ſay, that the King of* England *cannot be King of* England, *becauſe* God is King of all the earth, *Pſal.* 46. 8. *As if the King could not be Gods Vice-gerent, and the peoples viſible God: ſo the Pope Chriſts Vicar or Deputy, and the Churches viſible head. And let Kings beware how they give way to ſuch Arguments as theſe, leſt at the laſt ſuch inferences be made upon themſelves.*

As ſtrange an inference is that, how that the Church was not built upon Peter, *becauſe it was built upon his Confeſſion; as if it might not be built caſually upon the one, and formally upon the other: as if both theſe could not ſtand together. As if the Confeſſion of* Peters *Faith might not be the cauſe why Chriſt built his Church upon his Perſon; as if Chriſt did not as well (perſonally) tell him,* Tu es Petrus: *as (ſignificantly)* ſuper hanc Petram (id eſt, ſuper iſtam Confeſſionem) ædificabo Eccleſiam.

No leſſe invalid is that Objection of Proteſtants *againſt the œconomacy of the Biſhop of* Rome, viz. *that ſaying of* Greg. *ſometimes Biſhop of that ſea,* viz. He that intituled himſelf univerſall Biſhop, exalted himſelf like *Lucifer*, above his brethren, and was a fore-runner of Antichriſt: *As if there were no more meanings in the word Uniuerſality than one: as if there were not a Metaphoricall as well as a Literall and Grammaticall ſenſe: as if Saint* Gregory *might not cenſure this title of Univerſality in the Grammaticall, and excluſive meaning, (which being ſo taken, would have excluded all other Biſhops from their*

Offices, Eſſences, and Proprieties which they held under Chriſt) thereby depriving them of the Key of orders, and yet ſtill keep the Superiority, (viz. *of one Biſhop over another, and himſelf over all in a Metaphoricall and tranſferent ſenſe) thereby ſtill keeping the Key of Juriſdiction in his own hands; and this not onely is, but muſt be the meaning of Saint* Gregory; *for he thus explicates the matter himſelf,* lib. 4. ind. 13. ep. 32. *viz.* The care of the Church hath been committed to the Prince of all the Apoſtles, Saint *Peter: and yet had Saint* Peter *called himſelfe the Univerſall Apoſtle; in the firſt ſence (ſeeing that Chriſt Jeſus made ether Apoſtles as well as him) he had been no Apoſtle himſelf, but Antichriſt; and yet this hindred not, but that the care and principality was committed unto* Peter: *Whereby you may plainly ſee, how he aſcribes a head-ſhip over the Church, whilſt he denies the Univerſality of Epiſcopacy. Wherefore, having ſhewed Your Majeſty my Church, I humble beg, that You will be pleaſed either to give me a few lines in anſwer hereunto, or elſe to ſhew me Yours.*

The KINGS *Paper in Anſwer to the Marqueſſe.*

MY Lord: I have peruſed your Paper, whereby I find, that it is no ſtrange thing to ſee Errour tryumph in Antiquity, and flouriſh all thoſe Enſignes of Univerſality, Succeſſion, Unity, Converſion of Nations, &c. in the face of Truth: and nothing was ſo familiar either with the *Jews*, or *Gentiles*, as to beſmear the face of Truth with ſpots of novelty: For this was *Jeremiahs*

miahs case, Jer. 44. 16. viz. *As for the word which thou haſt ſpoken unto us in the Name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee, but we will certainly doe whatſoever thing goeth forth out of our owne mouths: to burn incenſe unto the Queen of heaven, and to powre out drink-offerings unto her as we have done, we, and our fathers, our Kings and our Princes in the Cities of* Judah, *and in the ſtreets of* Jeruſalem *as we have done:* there is Antiquity, *we and our Fathers:* there is Succeſſion, *In the Cities of* Judah *and* Jeruſalem: There is Univerſalitie: ſo *Demetrius*, urged Antiquity and Univerſality for his goddes *Diana:* viz. *That her Temple ſhould not be deſpiſed, nor her Magnificence deſtroyed, whom all* Aſia *and the world worſhipped.* So *Symachus* that wiſe Senator, though a bitter enemie to the Chriſtians: *Servanda eſt inquit tot ſeculis fides, & ſequendi ſunt nobis parentes qui feliciter ſequuti ſunt ſuos: we muſt defend that Religion which hath worne out ſo many ages, and follow our Fathers ſteps, who have ſo happily followed theirs.* So *Prudentius* would have put back Chriſtianity it ſelfe, *viz. Nunc dogma nobis Chriſtianum naſcitur poſt evolutos mille demum Conſules: Now the Chriſtian Doctrine begins to ſpring up after the revolution of a thouſand Conſul-ſhips:* But Ezekiel reads us another lecture. *Ne obdurate cervices veſtras ut patres veſtri, cedite manum Jehovæ, ingredimini ſanctuarium ejus, quod ſanctificavit in ſæculum, & colite Jehovam Deum veſtrum:* Be not ſtiff-necked as your forefathers were, reſiſt not the mighty God, enter into his Sactuary which he hath conſecrated for ever, and worſhip ye the Lord your God.

Radbodus, King of *Phrygia*, (being about to be baptized) asked the Biſhop, what was become of all his anceſtors, who were dead without being baptized? The

Biſhop

Biſhop anſwered: that they were all in hell; whereupon the King ſuddenly withdrew himſelfe from the font, (ſaying) *Ibi profectò me illis Comitem adjungam: Thither will I go unto them:* no leſſe wiſe are they, who had rather erre with fathers and Councels, then rectifie their underſtanding by the word of God, and ſquare their faith according to its rules.

Our Saviour Chriſt ſaith, we muſt not ſo much *hearken to what has been ſaid by them of old time*, Mat. 21. 12. as to that which *he* ſhall *tell you*, where *Auditis dictum eſſe antiquis* is exploded: and *Ego dico vobis* is come in its place, which of them all can attribute that credit to be given unto him, as is to be given to Saint *Paul*. Yet he would not have us to be followers of him more, then he is a follower of Chriſt, 1 *Cor.* 11. 1. Wherefore if you cry never ſo loud, *Sancta mater Eccleſia, ſancta mater Eccleſia*, the holy mother Church, holy mother Church as of old, they had nothing to ſay for themſelves, but *Templum Domini, Templum Domini*, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, we will cry as loud againe with the Prophet: *Quomodo facta eſt meretrix Urbs fidelis?* how is the faith full City become a harlot? if you vaunt never ſo much of your *Roman* Catholick Church: we can tell you out of Saint *John*, that ſhe is become the Synagogue of Sathan: neither is it impoſſible, but that the houſe of prayers may be made a Den of theeves: you call us hereticks; we anſwer you with Saint *Paul*, Act. 24. 14. *After the way which you call hereſie, ſo worſhip we the God of our fathers, believing all things which were written in the Law and the Prophets.*

I will grant you, that all thoſe marks which you have ſet downe, are marks of the true Church; and I will grant you more, that they were belonging to the Church of

of *Rome*: but then you muſt grant me thus much, that they are as well belonging to any other Church, who hold and maintaine that Doctrine which the Church of *Rome* then maintained, when ſhe wrought thoſe converſions: and not at all to her, if ſhe have changed her firſt love, and fallen from her old principles; for it will do her no good to keep poſſeſſion of the keyes, when the lock is changed: now to try whether ſhe hath done ſo or no, there can be no better way, then by ſearching the Scriptures; for though I grant you that the Catholick Church is the white in that Butt of earth at which we all muſt aime; yet the Scripture is the heart centre, or peg in the midſt of that white that holds it up, from whence we muſt meaſure, eſpecially when we are all in the white. We are all of us in *gremio Eccleſiæ*; ſo that controverſies cannot be decided by the Catholick Church, but by the Scriptures, which is the thing by which the neareneſſe unto truth muſt be decided; for that which muſt determine truth muſt not be fallible: but whether you mean the conſent of Fathers, or the decrees of generall Counſels, they both have erred; I diſcover no Fathers nakedneſſe; but deplore their infirmities, that we ſhould not truſt in armes of fleſh: *Tertullian* was a montaniſt, *Cyprian* a rebaptiſt; *Origen*, an Anthropomorphiſt; *Heirom*, a Monoganiſt; *Nazianzen*, an Angeliſt; *Euſebius*, an Arrian; Saint *Auguſtine* had written ſo many errors, as occaſioned the writing of a whole booke of retractations: they have often times contradicted one another, and ſometimes themſelves.

Now for generall Counſels: Did not that *Concilium Ariminenſe*, conclude for the Arrian hereſie? Did not that *Concilium Epheſinum*, conclude for the Eutichian hereſie? Did not that *Concilium Carthaginenſe*,

conclude it not lawfull for Prieſts to marry? Was not *Athanaſius* condemned *In concilio Tyrio*? Was not *Eiconolatria* eſtabliſhed *In concilio Nicæno ſecundo*?

What ſhould I ſay more? when the Apoſtles themſelves, leſſe obnoxious to error, either in life or doctrine, more to be preferred then any, or all the world beſides; one of them betraies his Saviour, another denies him; all forſake him. They thought *Chriſts Kingdome to have been of this world*; and a promiſe onely unto the Jewes, and not unto the Gentiles; and this after the reſurrection.

They wondered that *the holy Ghoſt ſhould fall upon the Gentiles*. Saint *John* twice *worſhipped the Angel*, and was rebuked for it, *Apoc.* 22. 8. Saint *Paul* ſaw how *Peter walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Goſpel*, Gal. 2. 14. Not onely *Peter*, but other of the Apoſtles, were ignorant, how the word of God was to be preached unto the Gentiles.

But who then ſhall rowl away the ſtone from the mouth of the monument? Who ſhall expound the Scriptures to us? one puls one way, and another another: by whom ſhall we be directed?

Scinditur incertum ſtudia in contraria vulgus.

You that cry up the Fathers, the Fathers ſo much; ſhall hear how the Fathers doe tell us that the Scriptures are their owne interpreters.

Irenæus, who was ſcholler to *Policarpus*, that was ſchollar to Saint *John*, lib. 3. cap. 12. thus ſaith, *Oſtentiones quæ ſunt in Scripturis non poſſunt oſtendi niſi ex ipſis Scriptur is*, the evidences which are in Scripture cannot be manifeſted but out of the ſame Scripture.

Clemens Alexandrinus, *Nos ex ipſis de ipſis Scripturis, perfectè*

perfectè demonſtrantes ex fide perſuademus demonſtrative: Strom. li. 7. Out of the Scriptures themſelves, from the ſame Scriptures perfectly demonſtrating, doe we draw demonſtrative perſwaſions from faith.

Cryſoſt. *Sacra Scriptura ſeipſam exponit, & auditorem errare non ſinit.* Baſilius Magnus, *Quæ ambiguè & quæ obſcurè, videntur dici in quibuſdam locis ſacræ Scripturæ, ab iis quæ in aliis locis aperta & perſpicua ſunt explicantur,* Hom: 13. in Gen. Thoſe things which may ſeeme to be ambiguous and obſcure in certaine places of the holy Scripture, muſt be explicated from thoſe places which elſe-where are plain and manifeſt.

Auguſtinus, Ille qui cor habet quod preciſum eſt, jungat Scripturæ, & legat ſuperiora vel inferiora & inveniet ſenſum. Let him who hath a preciſe heart joyne it unto the Scriptures: and let him obſerve what goes before, and that which follows after, and he ſhall find out the ſenſe.

Queſtionum aſceticarum ſecundum eptt regula trecentiſſima ſexageſſima.

Gregorius ſaith (Ser. 49. De verbis Domini.) *Per Scripturam loquitur Deus omne quod vult: & voluntas dei ſicut in teſtamento, ſic in evangelio inquiratur.* By Scripture God ſpeaks his whole mind; and the will of God, as in the old Teſtament ſo in the new, is to be found out.

Optatus contra Parmenonem, lib. 5. *Num quis æquior arbiter veritatis divinæ quam Deus, aut ubi deus manifeſtius loquitur quam in verbo ſuo:* Is there a better judge of the divine verity then God himſelfe? or where doth God more manifeſtly declare himſelfe then in his owne word?

What breath ſhall we believe then, but that which is the breath of God; the holy Scriptures? for it ſeems all one to Saint *Paul* to ſay, *dicit Scriptura,* the Scrip-

ture ſaith: *Rom.* 4. 3. and *dicit Deus* the Lord ſaith: *Rom.* 9. 17. *The Scripture hath concluded all under ſin*, Gal. 3. 22. *for that which* Rom. 11. 32. he ſaith, *God hath concluded all, &c.* how ſhall we otherwiſe conclude then but with the Apoſtle 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. *have received not the ſpirit of the world, but the ſpirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given unto us of God.*

They who know not this ſpirit, do deride it: but this ſpirit is *hidden Manna*, Apo. 2. 17. which God giveth them to eat who ſhall overcome; it is the white ſtone wherein the new name is written, which no man knoweth but he that received it. Wherefore we ſee the Scripture is the rule by which all differences may be compoſed: it is the light wherein we muſt walke: the food of our ſouls: an antidote that expels any infection: the onely ſword that kils the enemy: the onely plaſter that can cure our wounds: and the onely documents that can be given towards the attainment of everlaſting ſalvation.

The Marqueſſes reply to the Kings Paper.

May it pleaſe your moſt excellent Majeſty.

YOur Majeſtie is pleaſed to wave all the marks of the true Church; and to make recourſe unto the Scriptures.

I humbly take leave to aske your Majeſty what heretique that ever was did not doe ſo? How ſhall the greateſt heretique in the world, be confuted or cenſured; if any man may be permitted to appeale to Scriptures: margind with his

his own notes, ſenc'd with his owne meaning, and enlivened with his owne private ſpirit? to what end were thoſe marks ſo fully, both by the Prophets, the Apoſtles, and our Saviour himſelfe ſet downe, if we make no uſe of them? To what uſe are land-marks ſet up, if Marriners will not believe them to be ſuch?

Yet notwithſtanding after that I have ſaid, what I have to ſay in removall of certain obſtacles that lie in the way, I ſhall lead your Majeſty to my Church, through the full body of the Scriptures, or not at all, and then I ſhall leave it to your royall heart to judge (when you ſhall ſee that we have Scripture on our ſide) whether or no the interpretation thereof be likelier to be true, that hath been adjudged ſo by Councels, renowned Fathers, famous for ſanctity and holineſſe of life; continued for the ſpace of a thouſand or twelve hundred years, by your owne confeſſion, univerſally acknowledged; or that ſuch a one as Luther *(his word ſhall be taken, either without Scripture, or againſt it, with* ſic volo, *and* ſic jubeo; *a man who confeſſed himſelfe, that he received his doctrine from the Devil; or ſuch a one as* Calvin *and their aſſociates, notoriouſly infamous in their lives and converſations, plain Rebels to their* Moſes *and* Aaron, *united to the ſame perſon) ſhould counter ballance all the worthies determinations of Councels, and the continued practice, which ſo many ages produced.*

If your Majeſtie meanes by the Church all the profeſſors of the Goſpel; all that are Chriſtians, are ſo the true Church; then we are ſo in your owne ſenſe, and you in ours: then none who believe in the bleſſed Trinity, the Articles of the Creed; none, who deny the Scriptures to be the word of God, let them conſtrue them as they pleaſe, can be hereticall, or of a wrong Religion; therefore we muſt contradiſtinguiſh them thus: and by the Proteſtant *Church*

and Religion, we muſt underſtand thoſe opinions which the Proteſtants *hold contrary to the Church of* Rome; *and by the* Romane, *the opinions which they hold diſſenting from the* Proteſtant; *and then we will ſee whether we have Scripture for our Religion or not; and whether you have Scripture for what you maintaine; and whoſe opinions are moſt approved of by the Primitive times, and Fathers; and what ground your late Divines have built their new opinions upon; and then I ſhall give you Majeſtie an anſwer to the objection which you make againſt our Church: viz.* That ſhe hath forſaken her firſt love, and fallen from the principles which ſhe held, when ſhe converted us to Chriſtianity.

But firſt to the removall of thoſe rubs in our way; and then I ſhall ſhew as much reverence to the Scripture as any Proteſtant *in the world; and ſhall endeavour to ſhew your Majeſty that the Scriptures are the Baſis or foundation upon which our Church is built.*

Your Majeſty was pleaſed to urge the errors of certaine Fathers, to the prejudice of their authority; which I conceive would have been ſo, had they been all Montaniſts, Rebaptiſts, all Anthropomorphiſts, *and all of them generally guilty of the faults, wherewith they were ſeverally charged in the particulars: ſeeing that when we produce a Father, we doe not intend to produce a man in whoſe mouth was never found guile: the infallibility being never attributed by us, otherwiſe then unto the Church, not unto particular Church-men: as Your Majeſty hath moſt excellently obſerved, in the failings of the holy Apoſtles, who erred after they had received the holy Ghoſt, in ſo ample manner: but when they were all gathered together in Councell, and could ſend about their* edicts, *with theſe capitall letters in the front,* Viſum eſt ſpiritui ſancto & nobis, *Acts* 15.28.

then

then I hope your Majeſty cannot ſay, that it was poßible for them to erre.

So, though the Fathers might erre in particulars, yet thoſe particular errors would be ſwallowed up in a generall Councel, and be no more conſiderable in reſpect of the whole, then ſo many heat-drops of error, can ſtand in competition with a cloud of witneſſes, to the divine truth; and be no more prejudicicall to their generall determinations, then ſo many exceptions, are prejudiciall to a generall rule. Neither is a particular defection in any man any exception againſt his teſtimony, except it be in the thing wherein he is deficient; for otherwiſe we ſhould be of the nature of the flies, who onely prey upon corruption, leaving all the reſt of the body that is whole unregarded.

Secondly, Your Majeſty taxes generall Councels for committing errors. If Your Majeſty would be pleaſed to ſearch into the times wherein thoſe Councels were called, Your Majeſty ſhall find, that the Church was then under perſecution, and how that Arrian *Emperours, rather made Aſſemblies of Divines, then called any Generall Councels; and if we ſhould ſuppoſe them to be generall and free Councels, yet they could not be erroneous in any particular mans judgement, untill a like generall Councell ſhould have concluded the former to be erroneous; (except you will allow particulars to condemne generalls, and private men the whole Church) all generall Councels, from the firſt unto the laſt that ever were, or ſhall be, makes but one Church: and though in their intervals, there be no ſeßion of perſons, yet there is perpetuall virtue in their decretals, to which every man ought to appeale for judgement, in point of controverſie. Now as it is a maxim in our law,* Nullum tempus occurrit regi: *ſo it is a maxim in divinity,* Nullum tempus occurrit deo: Ubi deus eſt, *as he promiſed, I*

will

will be with you alwaies unto the end of the world; *that is with his Church, in directing her chief Officers, in all their conſultations, relating either to the truth of her doctrine, or the manner of her diſcipline: wherefore if it ſhould be granted, that the Church had at any time determined amiſſe; the Church cannot be ſaid to have erred, becauſe you muſt not take the particular time for the Catholick Church; becauſe the Church is as well Catholick for time as territory; except that you will make rectification an error.*

For as in civil affairs, if that we ſhould take advantage of the Parliaments nulling former acts; and thereupon conclude, that we will be no more regulated by its lawes, we ſhould breed confuſion in the Common-wealth; for as they alter their laws, upon experience of preſent inconveniences; ſo the Councels change their decrees according to that further knowledge *which the holy writ aſſures us, ſhall encreaſe in the latter daies; provided that this knowledge be improved by means approved of, and not by every enthuſiaſtick, that ſhall oppoſe himſelfe againſt the whole Church.*

If I recall my own words, it is no error, but an avoidance of error: ſo where the ſame power rectifies it ſelfe, though ſome things formerly have been decreed amiſſe, yet that cannot render the decrees of generall Councels not binding, or incident to error, quoad ad nos; *though in themſelves, and* pro tempore, *they may be ſo.*

As to Your Majeſties objecting the errors of the holy Apoſtles, and pen-men of the holy Ghoſt; and Your inference thereupon, viz. That truth is no where to be found but in holy Scripture; *under Your Majeſties correction, I take this to be the greateſt argument againſt the private ſpirit (urged by your Majeſty) its leading us into all truth, that could*

could poſsibly be found out. For if ſuch men (as they) indued with the holy Ghoſt, inabled with the power of working miracles; ſo ſanctified in their callings, and enlightened in their underſtandiugs could erre: how can any man (leſſe qualified) aſſume to himſelfe a freedome from not erring, by the aſsiſtance of a private ſpirit?

Laſtly, as to Your Majeſties quotations of ſo many Fathers, for the Scriptures eaſineſſe and plainneſſe to be underſtood. If the Scriptures themſelves doe tell us, that they are hard to be underſtood, ſo that the unlearned and unſtable wreſt them to their owne deſtruction: 2 *Peter* 3. 16. *and if the Scripture tells us, that the* Eunuch *could not* underſtand them except ſome man ſhould guide him: *as* Acts 8. 13. *and if the Scripture tells us, that Chriſts owne Diſciples could not underſtand them, untill Chriſt himſelfe* expounds them unto them, *as* Luke 24,25. *and if the Scriptures tell us, how the Angel wept much,* becauſe no man was able either in heaven or earth to open the Book ſealed with ſeven ſeals, nor to look upon it: *as* Apoc. 5. 1. *then certainly all theſe ſayings of theirs are either to be ſet to the errata's that are behind their books, or elſe we muſt look out ſome other meaning of their words, then what Your Majeſty hath inferr'd from thence; as thus, they were eaſie,* id eſt, in aliquibus, *but not in* omnibus locis; *or thus, they were eaſie as to the attainment of particular ſalvation, but not as to the generall cogniſance of all the divine myſtery therein contained, requiſite for the Churches underſtanding, and by her alone, and her conſultations and diſcuſments (guided by an extraordinary and promiſed aſsiſtance) onely to be found out; of which as to every ordinary man, this knowledge is not neceſſary, ſo hereof he is not capable.*

Firſt, we hold the reall preſence; you deny it: we ſay his

body is there: you ſay there is nothing but bare bread: we have Scripture for it, Mat. 20. 26. Take, eat, this is my body, *ſo* Luke 22. 19. This is my body which is given for you.

You ſay that the bread which we muſt eat in the Sacrament, is but dead bread; Chriſt ſaith that that bread is living bread: *you ſay* how can this man give us his fleſh to eat? *we ſay that that was the objection of Jews, and Infidels, (*1 John 6. 25.*) not of Chriſtians and believers: you ſay it was ſpoken figuratively; we ſay it was ſpoken really*, re vera, *or as we tranſlate it* indeed, *John 6. 55. But as the Jews did, ſo doe ye, Firſt*, murmur that Chriſt ſhould be bread, *John. 6. 41. Secondly*, that that bread ſhould be fleſh, *John 6. 52. And thirdly*, that that fleſh ſhould be meat indeed, *John 6. 55. untill at laſt you cry out with the unbelievers*, this is a hard ſaying, who can heare it? *John 6. 60. had this been but a figure, certainly Chriſt would have removed the doubt, when he ſaw them ſo offended at the reality*, John. 6.61. *He would not have confirmed his ſaying*, in terminis, *with promiſe of a greater wonder*, John 6. 62. *you may as well deny his incarnation, his aſcention, and ask*, how could the man come down from heaven and goe up againe? *(if incomprehenſibility ſhould be ſufficient to occaſion ſuch ſcruples in your breaſts) and that which is worſe then naught, you have made our Saviours concluſion an argument againſt the premiſes; for where our Saviour tels them thus to argue according unto fleſh and blood, in theſe words*, the fleſh profiteth nothing; *and that if they will be enlivened in their underſtanding, they muſt have faith to believe it in theſe words*, it is the Spirit that quickneth, *John 6. 63. They pervert our Saviours meaning into a contrary ſenſe, of their owne imagination:* viz. the fleſh profiteth nothing, *that is to*

ſay,

ſay, Chriſts body is not in the Sacrament: *but* in the Spirit that quickneth, *that is to ſay*, we muſt onely believe that *Chriſt* dyed for us, *but not that his body is there: as if there were any need of ſo many inculcations, preſſures, offences, miſ-believings, of and in a thing that were no more but a bare memoriall of a thing; being a thing nothing more uſuall with the Iſraelites: as the twelve ſtones which were erected as a ſign of the children of Iſraels paſſing over* Jordan: That when your children ſhall ask their Fathers what is meant thereby, then ye ſhall anſwer them, *&c.* Joſh. 4. *there would not have been ſo much difficulty in the belief, if there had not been more in the myſterie; there would not have been ſo much offence taken at a* memorandum, *nor ſo much ſtumbling at a figure.*

The Fathers are of this opinion, Saint Ignat. *in Ep. ad* Smir. *Saint* Juſtin. Apol: 2. ad Antonium: *Saint* Cyprian Ser. 4. de lapſis. *Saint* Ambr. lib. 4. de Sacram. *Saint* Remigius, &c. affirme the fleſh of Chriſt to be in the Sacrament, and the ſame fleſh which the word of God took in the Virgins wombe.

Secondly, We hold that there is in the Church an infallible rule for underſtanding of Scripture, beſides the Scripture it ſelfe, this you deny: this we have Scripture for, as Rom. 12. 16. *we muſt* propheſie according to the rule of faith: *we are bid to* walke according to this rule: *Gal.* 6. 16. *we muſt* encreaſe our faith, and preach the Goſpel, according to this rule: 1 *Cor.* 10. 15. *this* rule of faith, *the holy Scriptures call* a form of doctrine: *Romans* 6. 17. *a* thing made ready to our hands: 2. *Cor.* 10. 16. that we may not meaſure our ſelves by our ſelves: 2 *Cor.* 10. 12. the depoſitions *committed to the Churches truſt*, 1 Tim. 6. 20. for avoiding of prophane and vain bablings and oppoſitions of ſciences, *and by this* rule of

faith, *is not meant the holy Scriptures*; *for that cannot do it, as the Apoſtle tells us, whilſt there are* unſtable men *who wreſt this way and that way*, to their owne deſtruction; *but it is the tradition of the Church and her expoſition, as it is delivered from hand to hand as moſt plainly appears*, 2. Tim. 2. 2. *viz.* The things which thou haſt heard of us (not received in writing from me or others) among many witneſſes, the ſame commit thou to faithfull men, who ſhall be able to teach it to others alſo.

Of this opinion are the Fathers; *Saint* Irenæus 4. *chap.* 45. Tertul: de præſcr. *and* Vincent. lir. in ſuo commentario *faith*, It is very needfull in regard of ſo many errors proceeding from miſinterpretations of Scripture, that the line of propheticall and Apoſtolicall expoſition, ſhould be directed according to the rule of Eccleſiaſticall and Catholike ſenſe; *and ſaith* Tertullian *præſcript. adverſ. hæreſ. chap.* 11. We doe not admit our adverſaries to diſpute out of Scripture till they can ſhew who their Anceſtors were, and from whom they received the Scriptures: for the ordinary courſe of Doctrine, requires that the firſt queſtion ſhould be, from whom, and by whom, and to whom, the form of Chriſtian Religion was delivered; otherwiſe preſcribing againſt him as a ſtranger: *for otherwiſe if a heathen ſhould come by the Bible, as the* Eunuch *came by the Propheſie of* Eſay, *and have no* Philip *to interpret it unto him, he would find out a Religion rather according to his owne fancy, then divine verity.*

In matters of faith, Chriſt bids us to obſerve and doe whatſoever they bid us who ſit in Moſes ſeat, *Mat.* 22. 2. *therefore ſurely there is ſomething more to be obſerved then onely Scripture*; *will you not as well believe what you hear Chriſt*

Chriſt ſay, as what ye hear his Miniſters write? you hear Chriſt when you hear them, as well as you read Chriſt when you read his word: He that heareth you heareth me: *Luke* 10. 16.

We ſay the Scriptures are not eaſie to be underſtood; you ſay they are: we have Scripture for it, as is before manifeſted at large: the Fathers ſay as much: Saint Irenæus *lib. 2. chap.* 47. Origen: contr. Celſ: *and Saint* Ambr. *Epiſt.* 44. ad Conſtant. *calleth the Scripture a Sea and depth of propheticall riddles: and Saint* Hier. in præfat: comment. *in* Epheſ: *and Saint* Aug: Epiſt: 119. chap. 21. *ſaith:* The things of holy Scripture which I know not, are more then thoſe that I know: *and Saint* Denis, *Biſhop of* Corinth, *cited by* Euſebius, lib. 7. *hiſt.* Eccleſ. 20. *ſaith of the Scriptures,* that the matter thereof was far more profound then his wit could reach.

We ſay that this Church cannot erre: you ſay it can: we have Scripture for what we ſay; ſuch Scripture that will tell you that fools cannot erre therein: *Eſaiah* 35. 8. *ſuch Scripture as will tell you,* if you neglect to hear it, you ſhall be a heathen and a publican: *Mat.* 18. 17. *ſuch Scripture as will tell you, that this Church ſhall be unto Chriſt a glorious Church, a Church that ſhall be without ſpot or wrinkle:* Epheſians 5. 27. *ſuch a Church as ſhall be enlivened for ever with his Spirit:* Iſaiah 59. 21. *The Fathers affirm the ſame, Saint* Aug: contra Creſcon: *lib. 1. cap. 3. Saint* Cypr: Epiſt. 55. ad Cornel. *num:* 3. *Saint* Irenæus *lib. 3. chap.* 4. Cum multis aliis.

We ſay the Church hath been alwaies viſible; you deny it: we have the Scripture for it, Mat. 5. 14, 15. The light of the world; a City upon a hill cannot be hid: 2 Cor. 4. 3. Iſaiah 22.

The Fathers unanimouſly affirme the ſame; Origen:

Hom: 30. *in* Math: That the Church is full of light even from the Eaſt to the Weſt: *Saint* Chriſoſt: Hom: 4. *in* 6. *of* Iſaiah, That it is eaſier for the Sun to be extinguiſhed, then the Church to be darkned: *Saint* Aug: *tract: in Joan: calls them blind, who doe not ſee ſo great a mountain: and* Saint Cypr: *de Unitate Eccleſiæ.*

We held the perpetuall univerſality of the Church, and that the Church of Rome *is ſuch a Church: you deny it: we have Scripture for it,* Pſal. 2. 8. Rom. 1. 8. *the Fathers affirm as much,* Saint Cypr: ep. 57. *writing to* Cornelius *Pope of* Rome, *ſaith,* whilſt with you there is one mind and one voice, the whole Church is confeſſed to be the *Roman* Church. *Saint* Aug: de unitate Eccleſ. *chap.* 4. *ſaith,* who ſo communicates not with the whole corps of Chriſtendome, certaine it is that they are not in the holy Catholike Church. *Saint* Hier. in Apol. ad Ruffin. *ſaith,* that it is all one to ſay the Roman faith, and the Catholick.

We hold the unity of the Church to be neceſſary in all points of faith: you deny it: the ſeverall articles of your Proteſtant *Churches deny it: we have Scripture for it,* Eph. 4. 5. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſme. *Acts* 4. 35. 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. *The Fathers are of that opinion,* Saint Aug: cont. ep. Par. l. 3. *chap.* 5. *Saint* Cyp. lib. de unitate eccleſiæ nu. 3. *Saint* Hyl. lib. ad Conſtantium Auguſtum.

We hold that every Miniſter of the Church, eſpecially the ſupreme Miniſters or head thereof, ſhould be in a capacity of fungifying his office in preaching the Goſpel, adminiſtring the Sacraments, baptizing, marrying, and not otherwiſe, this we have Scripture *for,* Heb. No man taketh this honour unto himſelfe but he that is called of God, *as* Aaron *was: this you deny: and not onely ſo, but you ſo deny it,*

as

as that your Church hath maintained and practiſed it a long time, for a woman to be head or *ſupreme* moderatrix in the Church; *when you know that according to the word of God (in this reſpect) a woman is not onely forbid to be the head of the man, but to have a tongue in her head.* 1 Tim. 2. 11, 12. 1 Cor. 14. 34. *yet ſo hath this been denied by you, that many have been hang'd, drawn, and quartered, for not acknowledging it: the Fathers are of our opinion herein, Saint* Damaſcen. *ſer.* 1. Theod. *hiſt.* Eccleſ. *lib.* 4. *chap.* 28. *Saint* Ignat. *Epiſt.* ad Philodolph. *Saint* Chryſoſt. Hom. 5. de verbis Iſaiæ.

We ſay that Chriſt gave commiſſion to his Diſciples to forgive ſins, you deny it; and ſay, that God only can forgive ſins: we have Scripture for it, John 20.23. Whoſeſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted; and whoſeſoever ſinnes ye retain, they are retained: *and* John 20.21. As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you: *and how was that? viz. with ſo great power, as to forgive ſinnes:* Mat. 9. 3. 8. *where note, that Saint* Matthew *doth not ſet down, how that the people glorified God the Father, who had given* ſo great power *unto God the Son; but that he had given* ſo great power unto men, loco citato. *The Fathers are of our opinion, S.* Aug. *tract.* 49. *in* Joan. *Saint* Chryſ. de Sacerdotio. *l.* 3. *Saint* Ambroſ. *l.* 3. de penitentia. *St.* Cyril. *l.* 12. *c.* 50. *ſaith, it is not abſurd to ſay, That they ſhould remit ſinnes, who have in them the Holy Ghoſt: and Saint* Baſil. *l.* 5. cont. Eunom. *proved the Holy Ghoſt to be God, (and ſo confuted his hereſie) becauſe the Holy Ghoſt forgave ſinnes by the Apoſtles: and S.* Irenæus, *l.* 5. *c.* 13. *ſo S.* Greg. Hom. 6. Evang.

We hold, that we ought to confeſſe our ſinnes unto our Ghoſtly Father: this ye deny, ſaying, that ye ought not to confeſſe your ſinnes but unto God alone, this we prove out of

Scripture

Scripture: Mat. 3. 5, 6. Then went out Jeruſalem, and all *Judah*, and were baptized of him in *Jordan*, confeſſing their ſinnes: *this confeſſion was no generall confeſſion, but in particular; as appears*, Acts 19. 18, 19. And many that believed, came and confeſſed, and ſhewed their deeds.

The Fathers affirm the ſame; *S.* Irenæus, *l.* 1. *c.* 9. Tert. *lib.* de Pœnitentia: *where he reprehendeth ſome, who for humane ſhamefac'dneſſe, neglected to goe to confeſſion. Saint* Ambr. *ſate to hear confeſſion:* Amb. ex Paulſino: *S.* Clem. *Ep.* de fratr. Dom. Origen l. 3. Chryſ. l. 3. de ſacerd. *S.* Ambr. orat. in muliere peccatrice, *ſaith*, confeſſe freely to the Prieſt the hidden ſins of thy ſoul.

We hold, that men may doe works of ſupererogation, this you deny: This we prove by Scripture, Mat. 19. 12. *viz.* There be *Eunuches* which have made themſelves *Eunuches* for the Kingdome of Heaven: he that is able to receive it, let him receive it. *This is more then a Commandment, as Saint* Aug: *obſerves upon the place*, ſer. lib. de temp: *for of precepts it is not ſaid*, keep them, who is able, *but keep them abſolutely.*

The Fathers are of this opinion: Saint Amb: lib. de viduis. Orig: in c. 15. ad Rom. Euſeb. 1. demonſtrat. c. 8. *Saint* Chry: hom. 8. de act. pænit. *Saint* Greg. nicen. 15. Moral: c. 5.

We ſay, we have free-will, *you deny it, we prove we have out of Scripture, viz.* 1 Cor. 17. He that ſtandeth ſtedfaſt in his heart, having no neceſſity, but hath power over his own will, and hath ſo decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doth well.

Deut. 30. 11. I have have ſet before you life and death, bleſſing and curſing, chuſe life, that thou and thy ſeed may live: *And Chriſt himſelf ſaid*, O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem, how oft would I have gathered thy children together

gether, as a Hen gathers her Chickens, and ye would not? *where Chriſt would, and they would not: there might have been a willingneſſe as well as a willing, or elſe Chriſt had wept in vain; and to think that he did ſo, were to make him an impoſtor.*

The ancient Fathers are of our opinion: Euſeb: Cæſar: de præp. l. 1. c. 7. *Saint* Hilde: Trin: *Saint* Aug: l. 1. ad Simp: q. 4. *Saint* Ambr: in Luc: c. 12. *Saint* Chryſ: hom: 19. *in* Gen: Irenæus l. 4. c. 72. *S.* Cyril: l. 4. *in* Joan: *in* c. 7. &c.

We hold it poſſible to keep the Commandments; *you ſay it is impoſſible: we have Scripture for it,* Luke 1. 6. And they were both righteous before God: walking in all the Commandments and Ordinances of the Lord, blameleſſe: *and* 1 John 5. 3. His Commandments are not grievous.

The Fathers are for us: Orig: Hom: 9. *in* Joſue: *Saint* Cyril: *lib.* 4. cont: Julian: *Saint* Hyl: *in* Pſal. 118. *Saint* Hier: *lib.* 3. cont: Pelag: *Saint* Baſil:

We ſay, faith cannot juſtifie without works: yee ſay good works are not abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation: we have Scripture for what we ſay, 1 Cor. 13. 2. Though I have all faith, and have no charity, I am nothing: *and* James 2. 24. By works a man is juſtified and not by faith onely.

This opinion of yours Saint Aug: lib. de fide & oper: *cap.* 14. *ſaith, was an old hereſie, in the Apoſtles time; and in the preface of his Comment: upon the* 32. Pſal. *he calls it the right way to hell and damnation: See* Orig: *in* 5. *to the Rom:* S. Hillar. *chap.* 7. in Mat: S. Amb: 4. ad Heb: &c.

We hold, good works to be meritorious; you deny it: we have Scripture for it, Mat. 6. 27. He ſhall reward every

man according to his works. *Mat.* 5. 12. Great is your reward in heaven. *Reward at the end, preſuppoſes merit in the worke: the diſtinction of* ſecundum, *and* propter opera; *is too nice to make ſuch a diviſion in the Church.*

The Fathers were of our opinion. S. Amb: de Apolog: David. cap. 6. S. Hier: lib. 3. Cont: Pelag: S. Aug: de Spiritu & lit. cap. ult. *and divers others.*

We hold, that faith once had, may be loſt, if we have not care to preſerve it: You ſay it cannot; we have Scripture for it, viz. *Luke* 8. 13. They on the rock, are they, which when they hear, receive the word with joy: which, for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away. So 1 *Tim.* 1. 18, 19. Which ſome having put away, have made ſhipwrack of their faith.

This is frequently affirmed amongſt the Fathers, ſee S. Aug: de gratia, & lib. arbit. de correp. & gratia, & ad articulos.

We hold, that God did never inevitably damn any man before he was born: or as you ſay, from all eternity; you ſay, he did: we have Scripture for what we ſay, Wiſ: 1. 13. God made not death, neither hath he pleaſure in the deſtruction of the living. 1 *Tim.* 2. 34. God our Saviour, who will have all men to be ſaved. 2 *Pet.* 3. 9. The Lord is not willing that any ſhould die, but that all ſhould come to repentance: *and if you will not believe, when he ſaies ſo, believe him when he ſwears it:* As I live, *ſaith the Lord,* I doe not delight in the death of a ſinner.

The Fathers are of our opinion, S. Aug. lib. 1. Civit. Dei. Tertul. Orat. cap. 8. Saint Cypr. lib. 4. Epiſt. 2. *and* Saint Amb. lib. 2. de Cani & Abel.

We hold, that no man ought, infallibly, to aſſure himſelfe of his ſalvation: you ſay he ought, the Scripture ſaith we ought

ought not, 1 Cor. 9. 27. S. Paul *was not assured, but that* whilst he preached unto others, *he himselfe might become a cast-away.*

Rom. 11. 20. Thou standest in the faith: be not high-minded, but fear, &c. least thou also maist be cut off. *Phil.* 2. 12. Worke out your salvation with fear and trembling.

The Fathers are of our opinion: Amb: Ser. 5. *in* Psal. 118. S. Basil. *in* Constil. Monast. chap. 2. S. Hier: lib. 2. Advers. Pelagian: S. Crysost. Hom. 87. *in* Joan. S. Aug: *in* Psal. 40. S. Bernard Ser. 3. de Advent. *and* Ser. 1. de Sept. *saith,* Who can say I am of the Elect?

We say that every man hath an Angel guardian; you say he hath not; we have Scripture for it, viz. *Mat.* 18. 10. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say unto you, that in heaven, their Angels doe alwaies behold the face of my Father. *Acts* 12. 13. S. Peter *knocking at the door, they say,* it is his Angel; *they believed this in the Apostles time: the Fathers believed it along.* S. Greg. Dial. lib. 4. cap. 58. S. Athanas. de Communi Essentia. S. Chrys. Hom. 2. in ep. ad Colos. lib. 6. de Sacer. Greg. Turonens. lib. de gloria Martyr. S. Aug. ep. ad Probam cap. 19. *and* S. Jer. *upon these words,* Their Angels, *Mat* 17. 10. *calls it a great dignity, which every one hath from his Nativity.*

We say, the Angels pray for us, knowing our thoughts, and deeds; you deny it: we have Scripture for it, Zach. 1. 9, 10, 11, 12. Then the Angel of the Lord, answered, and said, O Lord of Hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the Cities of Judah, against whom thou hast had indignation, these three-score and ten years? *Apoc.* 8. 4. And the smoake of the

incenſe of the prayers of the Saints, aſcended from the hand of the Angel before the Lord.

This place was ſo underſtood by Irenæus, lib. 4. cap. 34. *and* S. Hillary *in* Pſal. 129. *tells us, This interceſſion of Angels, Gods nature needeth not, but our infirmities doe: So* S. Amb. lib. de viduis, Victor. utic. lib. 3. de perſecutione Vandalorum.

We hold it lawfull to pray unto them; you not: we have Scripture for it, Gen. 48. 16. The Angel which redeemed me from all evill, bleſſe theſe lads, &c. *Hoſea* 12. 4. He had power over the Angel, and prevailed: he wept and made ſupplications unto them.

Saint Auguſtine *expounding theſe words of* Job 19. 21. Have pitty upon me, O ye my friends, for the hand of the Lord is upon me, *ſaith, that holy* Job *addreſſed himſelfe to the Angels.*

We hold, that the Saints deceaſed, know what paſſeth here on earth; you ſay they know not: we have Scripture for it, Luke 16. 29. *where* Abraham *knew that there were* Moſes and the Prophets *Books here on earth, which he himſelfe had never ſeen when he was alive.*

The Fathers ſay as much, Euſeb. Ser. de Ann. S. Hier. *in* Epit. Paulæ. S. Maxim. Ser. de S. Agnete.

We ſay, they pray for us; you not: we have Scripture for it, Apoc. 5. 8. The twenty four Elders fell downe before the Lambe, having every one of them Harpes, and golden Viols, full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints. *Baruch* 3. 4. O Lord Almighty, thou God of Iſrael, hear now the prayers of the dead Iſraelites.

The Fathers were of this opinion, S. Aug. Ser. 15. de verbis Apoſt. S. Hilar. *in* Pſal. 129. S. Damaſ. lib. 4. de fide cap. 16.

We

We hold that we may pray to them; you not: we have Scripture for it, Luke 16.24. Father Abraham have mercy on me, and ſend Lazarus, &c. *You bid us ſhew one proof, for the lawfulneſſe hereof, when here are two Saints pray'd unto in one verſe: and though* Dives *were in Hell, yet* Abraham *in Heaven would not have expoſtulated with him ſo much, without a* non nobis Domine, *if it had been in it ſelfe, a thing not lawfull: You will ſay it is a parable; yet a jury of ten Fathers, of the grand inqueſt, as* Theophil. Tertul. Clem. Alex. S. Chryſ. S. Jer. S. Amb. S. Aug. S. Greg. Euthem. *and Ven.* Beda, *give their verdict, that it was a true Hiſtory: but ſuppoſe it were a parable; yet every parable is either true in the perſons named, or elſe may be true in ſome others: The Holy Ghoſt tells no lies, nor fables, nor ſpeaks not to us in parables, conſiſting either of impoſſibilities, or things improbable,* Job 5. 1. Call now, if there be any that will anſwer thee, and to which of the Saints wilt thou turne? *It had been a frivolous thing in* Eliphaz, *to have asked* Job *the queſtion; if invocation of Saints had not been the practiſe of that time.*

The Fathers affirme the ſame, S. Diony. c. 7. S. Athan. Ser. de Anunt. S. Baſil. Orat. 44. in Mat. S. Chryſ. Hom. 66. ad Popul. S. Hier. *pray'd to* S. Paula *in* Epitaph. S. Paulæ. S. Maximus *to* S. Agnes, Ser. de S. Agnete. S. Bern. *to our bleſſed Lady.*

We hold, Confirmation neceſſary; you not: we have Scripture for it, Acts 8. 14. Peter and John prayed for them, that they might receive the holy Ghoſt (for as yet he was fallen upon none of them; onely they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jeſus) Then laid they their hands on them; and they received the holy Ghoſt: *Where we ſee the holy Ghoſt was given in Confir-*

mation, which was not given in Baptiſme : alſo Heb. 6. 1. Therefore leaving the principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt, let us go on unto perfection, not laying againe the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith, towards God, of Baptiſme, and of Laying on of hands.

The Fathers affirme the ſame. Tert. lib. de Reſurrect. Carn. S. Pacian. lib. de Bapt. S. Amb. lib. de Sac. S. Hier. Cont. Lucif. S. Cypr. lib. 2. Ep. 1. *ſpeaking both of Baptiſme, and Confirmation, ſaith,* Then they may be ſanctified and be the ſons of God, if they be borne in both Sacraments.

We hold it ſufficient to communicate in one kind; you not : we have Scripture for it, John 6. 15. If any man eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever. *If everlaſting life be ſufficient, then is it alſo ſufficient to communicate under one kind : So* Acts 2. 42. And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and fellowſhip *(or communion)* and in breaking of bread and prayer : *where is no mention of the cup, and yet they remained ſtedfaſt in the Apoſtles doctrine,* Luke 24. 30. 8. 35. *where Chriſt communicated his* two Diſciples *under one kind.*

Saint Auguſtine *and* Theophylact, lib. de Conſenſ. Evang. cap. 25. *expound this place of the bleſſed Sacrament,* S. Chryſ. Hom. 17. oper. imperfecti.

We hold, that Chriſt offered up unto his Father, in the Sacrifice of the Maſſe (as an expiation for the ſins of the people) is a true and proper Sacrifice; this you deny : this we prove by Scripture, viz. *Malach.* 1. 11. From the riſing of the Sun, unto the going down of the ſame, my name ſhall be great among the Gentiles : and in every place incenſe ſhall be offered to my name, and a pure offering : *This could not be meant of the figurative offe-*

rings

rings of the Jewes, *becauſe it was ſpoken of the* Gentiles; *neither can it be underſtood, of the reall Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſſe; becauſe that was done but in one place, and at one time, and then, and there, not among the* Gentiles *neither: which could be no other, but the daily Sacrifice of the Maſſe; which is, and ever was, from Eaſt to Weſt, a pure and daily Sacrifice,* Luke 22. 19. This is my body, which is given for you: *not to you; therefore a Sacrifice.*

The Fathers are of this opinion: S. Clem. Apoſt. Conſt. lib. 6. cap. 23. *who calleth it a reaſonable, unbloudy, and Myſticall Sacrament,* S. Aug. lib. 1. Cont. adverſ. leg. & proph. cap. 18. 19. *calleth it a ſingular, and moſt excellent Sacrifice.* S. Chryſ. Hom. in Pſal. 95. *calleth it a pure and unbloudy hoſt, a heavenly, and moſt reverend Sacrifice.* S. Greg. Nicen. Orat. 4. de Reſurrect.

We ſay that the Sacrament of Orders, confers grace upon thoſe, on whom the hands of the Presbytery are impoſed; you both deny it to be a Sacrament, notwithſtanding the holy Ghoſt is given unto them thereby; and alſo you deny, that it confers any inferiour grace at all upon them: we have Scripture for what we hold, viz. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Propheſie, and with the laying on the hands of the Presbytery, So 1 *Tim.* 1. 6. Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on my hands.

S. Aug. lib. 4. Quæſt. ſuper Num. S. Cyp. Ep. ad Magnum. Optatus Milevit. *the place beginneth,* ne quis miretur. Tertul. in preſcript. *The place beginneth* Edant Origines.

We hold, that the Prieſt, and other Religious perſons who have vowed chaſtity to God, may not Marry afterwards; you deny, firſt, that it is lawfull to make any ſuch vows:

and

mation, which was not given in Baptiſme : alſo Heb. 6. 1. Therefore leaving the principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt, let us go on unto perfection, not laying againe the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith, towards God, of Baptiſme, and of Laying on of hands.

The Fathers affirme the ſame. Tert. lib. de Reſurrect. Carn. S. Pacian. lib. de Bapt. S. Amb. lib. de Sac. S. Hier. Cont. Lucif. S. Cypr. lib. 2. Ep. 1. *ſpeaking both of Baptiſme, and Confirmation, ſaith,* Then they may be ſanctified and be the ſons of God, if they be borne in both Sacraments.

We hold it ſufficient to communicate in one kind; you not : we have Scripture for it, John 6. 15. If any man eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever. *If everlaſting life be ſufficient, then is it alſo ſufficient to communicate under one kind : So* Acts 2. 42. And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and fellowſhip *(or communion)* and in breaking of bread and prayer : *where is no mention of the cup, and yet they remained ſtedfaſt in the Apoſtles doctrine,* Luke 24. 30. 8. 35. *where Chriſt communicated his* two Diſciples *under one kind.*

Saint Auguſtine *and* Theophylact, lib. de Conſenſ. Evang. cap. 25. *expound this place of the bleſſed Sacrament,* S. Chryſ. Hom. 17. oper. imperfecti.

We hold, that Chriſt offered up unto his Father, in the Sacrifice of the Maſſe (as an expiation for the ſins of the people) is a true and proper Sacrifice; this you deny : this we prove by Scripture, viz. *Malach.* 1. 11. From the riſing of the Sun, unto the going down of the ſame, my name ſhall be great among the Gentiles : and in every place incenſe ſhall be offered to my name, and a pure offering : *This could not be meant of the figurative offe-*

rings

rings of the Jewes, *becauſe it was ſpoken of the* Gentiles; *neither can it be underſtood, of the reall Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſſe; becauſe that was done but in one place, and at one time, and then, and there, not among the* Gentiles *neither: which could be no other, but the daily Sacrifice of the Maſſe; which is, and ever was, from Eaſt to Weſt, a pure and daily Sacrifice,* Luke 22. 19. This is my body, which is given for you: *not to you; therefore a Sacrifice.*

The Fathers are of this opinion: S. Clem. Apoſt. Conſt. lib. 6. cap. 23. *who calleth it a reaſonable, unbloudy, and Myſticall* Sacrament, S. Aug. lib. 1. Cont. adverſ. leg. & proph. cap. 18. 19. *calleth it a ſingular, and moſt excellent* Sacrifice. S. Chryſ. Hom. in Pſal. 95. *calleth it a pure and unbloudy hoſt, a heavenly, and moſt reverend* Sacrifice. S. Greg. Nicen. Orat. 4. de Reſurrect.

We ſay that the Sacrament of Orders, confers grace upon thoſe, on whom the hands of the Presbytery are impoſed; you both deny it to be a Sacrament, notwithſtanding the holy Ghoſt is given unto them thereby; and alſo you deny, that it confers any inferiour grace at all upon them: we have Scripture for what we hold, viz. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Propheſie, and with the laying on the hands of the Presbytery, So 1 *Tim.* 1. 6. Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on my hands.

S. Aug. lib. 4. Quæſt. ſuper Num. S. Cyp. Ep. ad Magnum. Optatus Milevit. *the place beginneth,* ne quis miretur. Tertul. in preſcript. *The place beginneth* Edant Origines.

We hold, that the Prieſt, and other Religious perſons who have vowed chaſtity to God, may not Marry afterwards; you deny, firſt, that it is lawfull to make any ſuch vows:

and

and ſecondly, That thoſe who have made any ſuch vowes, are not bound to keep them; we have Scripture for what we hold, Deuteronomie 23. 22. When thou ſhalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt not ſlack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will require it of thee. So 1 *Tim.* 5. 11, 12. But the younger widows refuſe, for when they have begun to wax wanton, againſt the Lord, they will marry, having damnation; becauſe they have caſt off their firſt faith. *What can be meant hereby, but the vow of Chaſtity? or by their firſt faith, but ſome promiſe made to Chriſt, in that behalfe? otherwiſe, Marriage could not be damnable: ſo all the antient Fathers have expounded it. Saint* Aug. lib. de bona viduit. cap. 9. *Saint* Athanaſ. lib. de Virginitat. *Saint* Epiph: Hereſ. 48. *Saint* Hier. cont. Jovin. lib. cap. 7.

We ſay, Chriſt deſcended into Hell, and delivered thence the Soules of the Fathers; ye deny it: we have Scripture for it, viz. *Epheſ.* 4. 8. When he aſcended up on high, he led captivity captive, &c. Deſcending firſt, into the lower part of the Earth. *This lower part of the Earth, could not be a Grave; for that was the upper part: nor could it have been the place of the damned; for the Devils would have been brought againe into heaven: more clearly,* Acts 2. 27. Thou wilt not leave my ſoule in Hell, neither wilt thou ſuffer thine holy one to ſee corruption: *there is hell for his ſoule for a time; and the grave for his body, for a while: plainer yet,* 1 Pet. 3. 18, 19. Being put to death in the fleſh, but quickned by the Spirit, by which alſo he went and preached unto the ſpirits in priſon: *this priſon cannot be heaven, nor hell, as it is the place of the damned; nor the grave, as it is the place of reſt; therefore it muſt be (as Saint* Aug. Epiſt. 99. ad Evod. *ſaith) ſome third place; which third place, the Fathers have*

have called Limbus patrum: *alſo* Zachary 9. 11. As for thee alſo, by the bloud of thy Covenant, I have ſent forth thy priſoners out of the pit wherein is water: *by this pit, could not be meant the place of the damned; for they have no ſhare in the Covenant; neither are they Chriſts priſoners, but the devils; neither could this pit be the grave; becauſe Chriſts grave was a new pit, where never any was laid before.*

The Fathers affirme as much; Saint Hier. in 4. ad Epheſ. *Saint* Greg. lib. 13. Moral. cap. 20. *Saint* Aug: in Pſal. 3. 7. *ver.* 1.

We hold purgatory fire, where ſatisfaction ſhall be made for ſinnes after death; you deny it: we have Scripture for it, 1 Cor. 3. 13. 15. The fire ſhall try every mans work of what ſort it is, if any mans work ſhall be burnt he ſhall ſuffer loſſe; but he himſelfe ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire. *

Laſtly, We hold extreme Unction to be a Sacrament; you neither hold it to be a Sacrament, neither doe you practice it, as a duty: we have Scripture for it, James 5. 13. Is any ſick among you? let him call the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oyle, in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick: and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up; and if he have committed ſins, they ſhall be forgiven him: *Neither any, nor all the Sacraments, were or could be more effectuall, mens good, nor more ſubſtantiall in matter, nor more exquiſite in forme; nor more punctuall in deſignation of its miniſtry: other Sacraments being bounded within the limits of the ſoules onely good; this extends it ſelfe to the good both of ſoule and body:* he ſhall recover from his ſickneſſe, and his ſins ſhall be forgiven him: *and yet it is both left out in your practiſe, and acknowledgment.*

* *Saint* Aug. *ſo interprets this place upon the* 37. Pſal. *alſo* S. Amb. *upon* 1 Cor. 3. *and* Ser. 20. *in* Pſal. 118. S. Hier. l. 2. cap. 13. ad verſ. Joan. S. *Greg.* lib. 4. dialog. c. 39. Orig. hom. 9. in c. 15. Exod.

The Fathers are on our ſide, Orig. Hom. 2. in Levit. S. Chryſ. lib. 3. de Sacerd. S. Aug. in ſpeculo & Ser. 215. de temp. Vener. Bed. *in* 6. Marke, *and* S. James, *and many others.*

Thus moſt Sacred SIR, *we have no reaſon to wave the Scriptures umpirage; ſo that you will hear it ſpeak in the mother language, and not produce it, as a witneſſe on your ſide, when the producers tell us nothing, but their owne meaning, in a language unknowne to all the former ages, and then tell us, that ſhe ſaith ſo, and they will have it ſo; becauſe, he that hath a Bible and a ſword, ſhall carry away the meaning from him that hath a Bible, and ne're a ſword: nor is it more blaſphemy, to ſay, that the Scripture is the Churches off-ſpring, becauſe it is the word of God, then it is for me to ſay, I am the ſonne of ſuch a man, becauſe God made me inſtrumentally; I am ſo, and ſo was ſhee; for as ſaith Saint* Aug: Evangelio non crederum, niſi me Eccleſiæ anthoritas commoveret. *I ſhould not believe the Goſpel it ſelfe, unleſſe I were moved by the authority of the Church. There was a Church, before there was a Scripture, take which Teſtament you pleaſe.*

We grant you, that the Scripture *is the Originall of all light: yet we ſee light, before we ſee the* Sun; *and we know there was a light, when there was no* Sun: *the one is but the body of the other. We grant you the* Scriptures *to be the Celeſtiall globe, but we muſt not grant you that every one knows how to uſe it; or that it is neceſſary or poſſible they ſhould. We grant that the* Scripture *is a light to our feet, and a lanthorne to our paths: then you muſt grant me that it is requiſite that we have a guide, or elſe we may loſe our way in the light, as well as in the darke. We grant you that it is the food of our ſouls, yet there muſt be ſome body that muſt divide, or break the bread. We grant you that it is the*

only

onely antidote againſt the infection of the Devil, yet it is not every ones profeſſion to be a compounder of the ingredients. We grant your Majeſty the Scripture to be the only ſword and buckler to defend a Church from her Ghoſtly enemies: yet I hope you will not have the glorious company of the Apoſtles, and the goodly fellow ſhip of the Prophets to exclude the noble Army of Martyrs, and the holy Church, which through all the world doth acknowledge Chriſt; wherefore having ſhewne Your Majeſtie how much the Scriptures are ours: I ſhall now conſider your opinions apart from us, and ſee how they are yours; and who ſides with You, in Your opinion, beſides Your ſelves: and firſt, I ſhall crave the boldneſſe to begin with the Proteſtants of the Church of England.

The Church of *England.*

WHoſe Religion, as it is in oppoſition to ours, conſiſts altogether in denying (for what ſhe affirms, we affirme the ſame) as the Reall preſence; the infallibility, viſibility, univerſality, and unity of the Church; confeſſion and remiſſion of ſins; free-will, and poſsibility of keeping the Commandments, &c. *All theſe things you deny, and you may as well deny the bleſſed Trinity (for we have no ſuch word in Scripture, onely inference) then that which ye have already denyed; and for which we have plaine Scripture, Fathers, Councels, practiſe of the Church: that which ye hold poſitive in your Diſcipline, is more erroneous, then that which is negative in your Doctrine: as your maintaining a woman to be head, Supreame, or Moderatrix in the Church, who by the Apoſtles rule is not to ſpeak in the Church (or that a Lay-man may be ſo) what Scripture, or*

Fathers, or cuſtome have ye for this? or that a Lay-man (as your Lay-Chancellour) ſhould excommunicate and deliver up ſoules to Sathan? Whereas matters of ſo weighty concernment, as delivering of mens ſoules into the Devils hands ſhould not be executed, and upon mature deliberation, and immergent occaſions, and not by any, but thoſe who have the undoubted Authority; leſt otherwiſe, you make the Authority it ſelfe to be doubted of. A ſtrange Religion, whoſe Miniſters are denyed the power of remitting ſins; whilſt Lay-men are admitted to the power of retaining them: and that upon every ordinary occaſion, as non-payment of fees, and the like: Whereas ſuch practiſes as theſe have rendred the rod of Aaron, *no more formidable then a reed ſhaken with the wind; ſo that you have brought it to this, that whilſt ſuch men as theſe were permitted to excommunicate for a threepeny matter, the people made not a threepeny matter of their Excommunication.*

The Church of *Saxony*.

Ad Argent. An. 1525.

NOw for the Church of Saxony, *you ſhall find* Luther, *a man not only obtruding new Doctrine upon his Diſciples, without Scripture, or contrary to Scripture; but alſo Doctrine denying Scripture, to be Scripture, and vilipending thoſe books of Scripture, which were received into the Canon, and acknowledged to be the word of God, in all ages.* As,

c Luther anvival. tit. de lib. novi & ver. teſtam. Rebenſtock, lib. 2. Colloq. læt. *Luth.* c. de vet. teſt.

The book of Eccleſ. *ſaying, That* it hath never a perfect ſentence in it, *and that* the Author thereof had neither boots nor ſpurs, but rid upon a long ſtick, or begging ſhooes, as he did when he was a Fryar. *c*

And the book of Job, *that* the argument thereof, is a meer

meer fiction; invented onely, for the ſetting downe of a true and lively example of patience. *d*

That it is a falſe opinion, and to be aboliſhed, that there are four Goſpels; and that the Goſpel of S. *John* is only true. *e*

That the Epiſtle of S. *James* is contentious, ſwelling, dry, ſtrawy, and unworthy an Apoſtolical ſpirit. *f*

And that Moſes in his writings, ſhewes unpleaſant, ſtopped and angry lips; in which the word of grace is not, but of wrath, death and ſin. *g*

He calls him a Goaler, Executioner, and a cruell Serjeant. *h*

For his doctrine: He holds, a threefold Divinity: or three kinds; as there are three perſons *whereupon* Zwinglius *taxes him for maning* three Gods, or three Natures in the Divinity. *i*

He himſelfe is angry with the word Trinity, calling it a humane invention, and a thing that ſoundeth very coldly. *k*

He juſtifies the Arrians, *and ſaith*, they did very well in expelling the word (*Homouſion*) being a word that his ſoule hated. *l*

He affirmed that Chriſt was from all eternity, even according to his humane nature: *taxed for it by* Zwing. *in theſe words*, how can Chriſt then be ſaid to be borne of a woman? *m*

He affirmes that, as Chriſt dyed with great pain, ſo he ſeeems to have ſuſtained pains in Hell after death. *n*

That the divinity of Chriſt ſuffered, or elſe he were none of his Chriſt. *o*

That if the humane nature ſhould only ſuffer for him, that Chriſt were but a Saviour of a vile account, and had need himſelfe of another Saviour. *p*

d Luth. Ser. convivi. tit. ut ſupra. & tit. de Patrick. & Prophe.

e Luth. præfat. in nov. teſt. & lib de deſcript. & *Eccleſ.* auth. c. 3.

f Luth. præf. in Epiſt. Tac. edit. Jenenſi.

g Luth. Tom. 3. Wit fol 422.

h Fol. 421. 422.

i Zwingl. part. 2. fol. 474.

k Luth. poſtill. majore *Baſil* apud Hurv g. enarr Evang. dom. Trinit.

l Luth. l cont. Iatomum. wit. imp. an. 1551.

m Zwingl. Part. 2. fol. 402.

n Luth. tom. 3. fol. 219.

o Luth. lib. de Concil. part. 2 & Holſp. Hiſt. Sac. part. 2 fol. 76.

p Luth. Confeſſ. ma. de cœna. tom. 3. ten. fol. 454.

Luther *held not onely conſubſtantiation, but alſo (ſaith* Hoſpinian*) that* the body and bloud of Chriſt both is, and may be found, according to the ſubſtance, not only in the bread and wine of the Euchariſt: or in the hearts of the faithfull, but alſo in all Creatures, in fire, water, or in the rope and halter wherewith deſperate perſons hang themſelves. *q*

He averreth, that the Ten Commandments belong not unto us, for God did not lead us, but the Jewes forth of *Ægypt*. r

That faith, except it be without (even the leaſt) good works, doth not juſtifie, and is no faith: *Whereof you may ſee him condemned and cited by* s

That we are equall in dignity and honour with Saint *Paul*, Saint *Peter*, or the bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, or all the Saints. *t*

That all the holineſſe which they have uſed in faſting, and prayer, enduring labours, chaſtiſing their bodies, auſterity and hardneſſe of life, may be daily performed by a hog or a dog. *u*

That in abſence of a Prieſt, a woman or a boy, or any Chriſtian may abſolve. *w*

That they onely communicate worthily, who have confuſed and erroneous conſciences. *x*

That a Prieſt, eſpecially in the new Teſtament, is not made, but borne; not conſecrated, but created. *y*

That the Sacrament were true, though it were adminiſtred by the Devil: *See him baited for it by two of his fellow Proteſtants*. z

That among Chriſtians no man can, or ought to be a Magiſtrate; but each one is to other equally ſubject: and that among Chriſtian men, none is ſuperiour ſave one, and only *Chriſt*: (a) That the husband, in caſe the

q Hoſpin. v. 61. ſup. a. fol. 44. *Luth.* ſer. de Moſe.

r See epiſt. ad Galat. c. 4. & c. 20. Exod.

s Covel. def. of M. *Hooker*. pag. 42.

t Luth. tom. 5. fol. 442.

u Luth. præf. in *Alex.* lib. de Eccleſ.

w Luth. tom. 2. fol. 103.

x Ibid. fol. 73.

y Ibid fol. 367.

z Hoſp. Hiſt. Sac. part 2. fol. 14. Covel. def. of *Hooker*, pag. 101.

a Luth. tom. 6. *Ger.* de ſacral. poteſt.

the wife refuſe his bed; may ſay unto her, if thou wilt not, another will; if the Miſtreſſe will not, let the maid come. *(b)* That the Magiſtrates duty is to put ſuch a wife to death: and that if that the Magiſtrate omit to doe ſo, the husband may imagine that his wife is ſtolne away by theeves, and ſlaine, and conſider how to marry another. *c*

b Luth. tom. 5. fol. 123.

That the adulterer may flie into another Country; and if he cannot contain, marry againe. *d*

c Ibid. fol. 123. See alſo 111.

d Luth. Ibid. fol. 123.

That Polygamy is no more abrogated then the reſt of *Moſes* Law; and that it is free, as being neither commanded, nor forbidden. *e*

e Luth. propoſ. de Bigam. Epiſt. An. 1528. propoſ. 62. 65, 66. See in c. 16. Gen. edit. An. 525.

That it is no more in his power to be without a woman, then it is in his power to be no man: and that it is more neceſſary then to eat, drink, purge, or blow his noſe. *f*

I will give you the latine of another opinion of his, becauſe they are his owne words; but not any of my engliſh ſhall be acceſſary to the tranſportation of ſuch a blaſt into my native language: Perinde faciunt qui continenter vivere inſtituunt, acſi qui excrementa vel lotium contra naturæ impetum retinere velit: *(g) Luther ſaith*, How can man prepare himſelfe to good? ſeeing it is not in his power to make his waies evill; for God worketh the wicked work in the wicked. *h*

f Luth. tom. 5. fol. 119.

g Luth. in ſuo gloſſem. in decret. Noreberg.

But I pray you where have you this, or any of all this in Scripture, nay what Scripture have you for it? that Scripture ſhould be no Scripture, as hitherto he hath made a great part of it; and Zwingl. *almoſt all the reſt, denying all* Pauls *Epiſt: to be ſacred:* Zwing. *tom.* 2. fol. 10. *What Councel, what Fathers, what primitive, or ſequent Church* (Uſq; ad) *ever taught or approved ſuch doctrine as this? and how are we cryed out upon for errors, notwithſtanding*

h Luth. tom. 2. Wit. An. 1551. aſſert. art. 36. alſo de ſervo. arbit. edit. 1603. fol. 195.

we

we have all for our Juſtification? and yet this is the man that boaſted, that Chriſt was firſt publiſhed by him; *(i) and by all of you that he was the firſt reformer: this is he who calls himſelfe* a more excellent Doctor then all thoſe who are in the papacy. *k*

i Luth. Ep. ad Argent. An. 1525.

k Epiſt. ad Anonymum. tom. 5.

This is he who thus brags of himſelfe, viz. Dr. *Martin Luther* will have it ſo, a *Papiſt* and an *Aſſe* are directly the ſame; ſo is my will, ſuch is my command; my will is my reaſon. *l*

l Luth tom. 5. Germ. fol. from 141. to 144.

This is he that tells you, I will have you to know, that I will not (hereafter) vouchſafe you the honour, as that I will ſuffer either you, or the very Angels of heaven, to judge of my doctrine, &c. Nor will I have my doctrine judged by any, no not by the Angels themſelves: for I being certaine thereof, will (by it) be judge both of you and the Angels. *m*

m Luth. adverſ. falſo nomin. Eccleſ. ſtat. prope init.

And laſtly, this is he that gave the alarme to all Chriſtendome, of the errors, idolatries, ſuperſtitions and prophaneneſſe of the Church of Rome: *but what Scriptures have you for it, that you ſhould not belive the Scriptures? what Fathers have you, that you ſhould not believe the Church? what cuſtome have you, that you ſhould not believe the Fathers, rather then any private interpretation? the promiſed holy Ghoſt, alwaies ruling in the Church, rather then the preſumed private Spirit in any particular man.*

The Church of *Geneva.*

NOw *for the Church of* Geneva: Calvin *comming after him, is not contented to ſtop himſelfe at* Luthers *bounds; but he goes further, and detracts not onely from the Scripture, but from Chriſt and God himſelfe. For firſt,* He

He maintaines, that three eſſences doe ariſe out of the holy Trinity. *a*

That the Sonne hath his ſubſtance diſtinct from the Father; and that he is a diſtinct God, from the Father. *b*

He teacheth that the Father can neither wholly, nor by parts, communicate his nature to Chriſt; but muſt withall be deprived thereof himſelfe. *c*

He denies *that* the Sonne is begotten of the Fathers ſubſtance and eſſence; affirming that he is God of himſelfe, not God of God: (*d*) *He ſaies, that* that dream of the abſolute power of *God*, which the Schoolmen have brought in, is execrable blaſphemy. *e*

He ſaith, that where it is ſaid, that the Father is greater then I, it hath been reſtrained to the humane nature of Chriſt; but I doe not doubt to extend it to him as God and man. *f*

He ſevereth the perſon of the Mediator from Chriſts divine perſon; maintaining with Neſtorius two *perſons in Chriſt, the one humane, and the other divine.* *g*

That Chriſts ſoule was ſubject to ignorance; and that this was the onely difference betwixt us, and him: that our infirmities are of neceſſity, and this was voluntary. *h*

That it is evident that ignorance was common to Chriſt, with the Angels. *i*

And particulariſeth wherein, viz. *that* he knew not the day of Judgement; (*k*) *Nor that* the Fig-tree was barren which he curſed, *till he came near it.* *l*

He is not afraid to cenſure, certaine words of Chriſt to be but a weak confutation, of what he ſought to refute. (*m*) *And ſaies*, Chriſt ſeems here not to reaſon ſolidly. *n*

He tells us that this ſimilitude of Chriſt ſeemes to be harſh,

a Tract. theol. p. 793.

b Act. Serv. p. 249, 250. 871, 872.

c Tract. theol. p. 771, 772.

d 1 Inſtit. c. 13. Sect. 23. 29.

e *Calv.* ad c. 23. Ezech. gal. ſcript. alſo Inſtit. l. 3. c. 23. Sect. 2.

f Tract. theol. p. 794. ſee p. 792. & 2. Inſtit. cap. 14. Sect. 3. and cap. 17. Jo. v. 12. and c. 22. Math.

g Lib. 1. Inſtit. cap. 13. Sect 9. 19, 24.

h In cap. 2. Luke v. 40.

i In cap. 24. Mat. v. 36.

k In cap. 24. Mat. v. 36.

l In c. 21. Mat. ver. 19. *alſo* ib. c. 9. v. 2.

m In c. 12. Mat. v. 25.

n Id. in c. 9. Mat. v. 5.

harſh, and farre fetch'd, and (a little after) the ſimilitude of ſitting doth not hang together. *o*

o Calv. in c. 16. & 22. Luke.

Where Chriſt inferred All things, therefore whatſoever you will, &c. Calvin *giveth it this gloſſe:* It is a ſuperfluous or vaine illation. *p*

p In c. 7. Mat. v. 12.

This Metaphor of Chriſt is ſomewhat harſh: (*q*) *He ſaith*, inſomuch as Chriſt ſhould promiſe from God a reward to faſting, it was an improper ſpeech. *r*

q In.c.9.Mat. v. 49.

r In Mat.c.9. v. 16,17,18.

He writeth of a ſaying of Chriſt, that it ſeemes to be ſpoken improperly, and abſurdly, in French *ſans raiſon.* s

s In. c. 3. Joan. v. 21.

He ſaith, that Chriſt refuſed, and denyed, as much as lay in him, to performe the office of a Mediator. *t*

t In c. 26. Mat. v. 39.

That he manifeſted his owne effeminateneſſe, by his ſhunning of death. *u*

u Cap. 12. Jo. v. 27.

He ſaith, that Theeves, and malefactors, haſten to death with obſtinate reſolution; deſpiſing it with haughty courage, others mildly ſuffer it: but what conſtancy, ſtoutneſſe, or courage was there in the Son of God, who was aſtoniſhed, and in a manner, ſtriken dead with fear of death? how ſhamefull a tenderneſſe was it, to be ſo far tormented with fear of common death, as to melt in bloudy ſweat, and not to be able to be comforted but by the ſight of Angels? *w*

w Lib. 2. Inſtit. c. 16. Sect. 22.

And that the ſame vehemency took him from the preſent memory of the heavenly decree; ſo that he forgot at that inſtant, that he was ſent hither to be our redeemer. *a*

a In c. 26. Mat. v. 39.

This prayer of Chriſt was not premeditate: but the force, and extremity of grief, wringed from him this haſty ſpeech; to which a correction was preſently added, *and a little before*, he chaſtiſeth, and recalleth that vow of his, which he had let ſuddainly ſlip. *b*

b Id. 16.

Thus

Thus doe we ſee Chriſt to be on all ſides ſo vexed, as being over-whelmed with deſparation, he ceaſed to call upon God: which was as much as to renounce his ſalvation, and this *(ſaith he) a little before*, was not fained, or as a thing only acted upon a ſtage. *e*

That Chriſt in his ſoul ſuffered the terrible torments of a damned and forſaken man. *d*.

In the death of Chriſt occurs a ſpectacle full of deſperation. *e*

In this ſpectacle there was nothing but matter of extreame deſpair. *f*

It is no marvell if it be ſaid that Chriſt went downe into Hell, ſince he ſuffered that death wherewith God in wrath ſtriketh wicked doers. *g*

That Chriſt ſitting at the right hand of his Father, holds but a ſecond degree with him in honour, and rule, and is but his Vicar. *h*

Laſtly, Calvin *holds it to be* abſurd, that Chriſt ſhould challenge to himſelfe, the glory of his owne reſurrection; when the Scripture, *ſaith he*, every where teacheth it to be the work of God the Father. *i*

That God is the Author of all thoſe things, which theſe Popiſh Judges would have to happen onely by his idle ſufferance, *Inſtit. lib. cap.* 18. *Sect.* 3.

That our ſins are not onely by his commiſſion, but decree, and will: 16. Sect. 1, 2. & lib. 2. cap. 4. Sect. 3, 4. *Which blaſphemy is condemned by his famous brethren:* Fleming. lib. de univerſ. grat. p. 109. Oſiander Euchir. Controverſ. p. 104. Schaffm. de peccat. cauſis. p. 155. 27. Sitzlinus diſput. Theol. de providentia Dei, Sect. 141. *Inſomuch that the Magiſtrates of* Berne, *made it penall by their Laws, for any man to preach, or read any of his books or doctrine:* Vide literas Senat. Bern. ad miniſtros, An. 1555.

e In c. 27. Mat. v. 46, 47.

d Lib. 2 Inſtit. c. 16. Sect. 10.

e In c. 27. Mat v. 57.

f In c. 14. Joan. v. 6.

g Lib. 2. Inſtit. c. 6. Sect. 10.

h In c. 26. Mat. v. 64.

i In c. 2. Joan. *alſo in* c. 8. ad Rom.

This man ſtrikes neither at the right hand, nor on the left, but at the King of Iſrael *himſelfe; who can thinke this mans mouth any ſlander, or his invections, a depravement, when he belches forth ſuch blaſphemies againſt the Son of God, in whom* the fulneſſe of the God-head dwelt bodily *? or who could thinke this man fit to reforme a Church, when nothing more required reformation then his owne errours ? But what Scriptures or Fathers is there for all this ?*

The Doctrine of the *Zwinglians*.

ZWinglius *confeſſeth himſelfe to have been* inſtructed againſt the Maſſe, by a certaine admoniſher, which he knew not, whether it was black or white. *k*

The ſame derided, as illuſion *by the learned Proteſtants.* l

The ſame as Luther's *Devil, largely ſet downe by himſelfe.* m

He is taxed by Calvin *for* depraving the Scripture, for changing the word *eſt*, and putting in *ſignificat* in his Tranſlation of the New Teſtament: *He ſaies, that* theſe ſayings, and the like, *viz.* If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments, &c. are but ſuperfluous and hyperbolicall. *o*

He denies, *that* Originall ſin can damne us; calling it but a diſeaſe or contagion. *p*

He maketh Baptizing of Infants, a thing indifferent; which may be uſed or left off. *q*

That Princes may be depoſed by the godly, if they be wicked, or goe contrary to the rule of Chriſt. *r*

He ſaith, that when we commit adultery, or murder, it

k Zwingl. tom. 2. fol. 249.

l Andr. confut. *Grinæ.* p. 128. 254. 304. *Schluſ.* Theol. *Calv.* 6. 1. in Proœm.

m In tom. 7. wit. fol. 228. and tom. 6. *Germ.* tenen. fol. 28. *Calv.* theol. l. 2. Act. 1. *Zwingl.* tom. 2. fol. 210.

o Zwingl. tom. 1. 137.

p Zwingl. tom. 2. fol. 90. See fol. 89. 115, 116. and in Epiſt. Oecol. & *Zwingl.* l. 1. p. 252. 258.

q Tom 2. fol. 96.

r Tom. 1 fol. 84, 85. & lib. 4. Epiſt. *Swingl:* & Oecol. p. 868, 869

it is the work of God: being the mover, the Author, or inciter, &c. God moveth the thiefe to kill, &c. he is forced to ſin, &c. God hardned *Pharaoh*, not ſpeaking hyperbolically, but he truly hardned him, though he had reſiſted. *s*

s Zwing. to. 10. de provid. Dei, fo: 365, 366, 367.

For which he is particularly reprehended by the learned Proteſtant, Grawerus. (*t*) *But where is there any Scripture, or Fathers or Doctors of the Church, that ever taught this Doctrine before?*

t *Abſurda*: Abſurd: c. 5. de prædeſt. fo. 394

Melancthons Doctrine.

FOr Melancthon *he taught that* there are three Divinities, as there are three Perſons. *u*

u *Melanct.* loc. com. An. 1545. c. de Chriſto.

For which he is reprehended by Stancarus. *w*

w l. 4. de Trin.

He affirmes polygamy, not to be againſt *Jus Divinum: and adviſeth* Hen. 8. *unto it.* *x*

x *Melanc.* Concil. Theol. pag. 134.

He teacheth peremptory reſiſtance againſt Magiſtrates. *y*

y Ep. ad Rom. cap. 13.

He inableth the inferiour Magiſtrate, to alter Religion againſt the contrary Edicts of the Superiour. *z*

z Con. Theol. part 1. p. 314.

So Calvin, *ſo* Beza, *ſo* Goodman, *ſo* Danæus, *ſo* Knox, *ſo* Buch: *ſo* Bancroft, *ſo* Fenners, *ſo* Scutcliff, *ſo* Hottomanus, *ſo* Ficlerus, *ſo* Renekerus, *all hold it lawfull, to depoſe, murder, or to arraigne their Prince. Call in forraigne ayd to aſſiſt them. Beſtow the Crown at their pleaſure. Deſtroy them, either by peaceable practices, or open War. Propoſe rewards to ſuch: but where have they Scriptures, or Fathers, or times, that ſhewed the practiſe of ſuch doings, before theſe latter times, and latter practices?*

The Doctrine of *Andreas Muſculus.*

AS *for* Andreas Muſculus, *he was not afraid openly to teach, that* the Divine Nature of Chriſt, *(which is God)* died upon the croſſe with his humane Nature. *Neither did he deſiſt (publickly) to profeſſe and ſpread abroad this Doctrine of the death of Chriſts Divinity. And that by the help of* Johannes Iſlebius. *Thus far.* c

c Sylveſt. Ezecanorius. Dial. de corrupt. mor. art 3. fol. 5. See *Andr. Muſcul.* and *Iſleb.* in refut. *Simleri.*

It is manifeſt, (*ſaith* Simlerus) *forth of the writings of* Brentius, Myricus, *and* Andreas Muſculus, *that* they make nothing of the aſcention of Chriſt, but a vaniſhing, or diſappearing. *What is this but making way for Mahomet? but what Scriptures, or Fathers, or times hath he wherein this Doctrine was ever taught before?* d

d In vita *Bulling.* fol. 55.

The Diviſions of *Proteſtants.*

IF *Ye would but conſider, how the* Lutherans *are divided into Antinomians, Oſiandrians, Majoriſts, Synergiſts, Stancarians, Amſdorfians, Flaccians, Subſtantiarians, Accidentarians, Adjaphoriſts, Muſculans of Effingereans, Vibiquiliſts,* &c. *So* diſſenting from, and perſecuting one another, that they will not permit one another to live in the ſame Town, *in ſo much, that* Oecolampadius *reckons up* ſeventy ſeven changes, *not onely in their explanations of Scripture, but alſo in certaine imaginary phantſies. (e) Or if we ſhould conſider the Diviſions that are between the old and new Sacramentaries, the old, called* Zwinglians: *the new,* Calviniſts; *with us, Puritans: in* France, *Hugonots: in other places Formaliſts, elſewhere Familiſts: ſomewhere Browniſts: every where Armi-*

e Lin. germ. æqua. reſp. ad *Luth.* Prefat.

Arminians, Seekers, Dippers, Shakers, Adamiſts.

Luther *complaining of* ſeven Sects riſen in two years; *(f) And we of new Sects riſing every day; If we ſhould conſider the ſeverall ſpecies of Independency, how it hath brought Religion to nothing, but Confuſion, we would conclude with Saint* Anguſtine, *That* it is neceſſary, that (rent and divided into ſmall pieces) we periſh, who have preferred the ſwelling pride of our haughty Stomacks, before the moſt holy band of Catholick peace and Unity. *g*

f Tom. 16. fol. 335.

g Aug. cont. Parm. l. 1. c. 4.

Whilſt the Catholicks have no jars undecided, no differences uncompoſed; having one common Father, one Conductor and Adviſer; as Sir Edward Sands *confeſſeth.* (*h*) None contend about the Scripture, all Conſent and Credit the Fathers, adhere to the Councels, ſubmit to the holy Sea of *Rome.* And the Diviſions that are, are but humane diſſentions, *as is confeſſed by* Luther, (*i*) Beza, (*k*) Whitaker, (*l*) Fulk (*m*) *&c.*

h In his Relat. of Religion Sect. 47. fol. 5. 2, 8.

i Tom. fol. 380.

k Beza Epiſt. 1

l Whit. de Eccleſ. cont. Bell. cont. 2. q. 5. p. 327.

m Fulk ag. Heſk. Sand. *&c.* p. 293.

Thus Religion, being at Unity with it ſelfe, is the true Speculum Creatoris, *or looking glaſſe of the Creatour: wherein the full proportion of a Deity may be ſeen: but once broken into pieces, it may repreſent divers faces, but no true proportion: and loſeth at once both its value, and its virtue.*

I have thus preſented Your Majeſty, with a view of the Cotholick Religion, aſſerted by the Fathers; and the Proteſtant Religion aſſerted by their founders. I ſhall humbly deſire Your Majeſties further patience, that Your Majeſtie will be pleaſed to conſider the lives and Converſations of the one, and of the other: Firſt the rare Sanctity, and admired holineſſe, which all ages and writers have aſcribed unto theſe holy Fathers. And the ſtrange and unheard of blaſphemies, vileneſſe and wickedneſſe that are caſt upon the

the other, not by any of their Adverſaries, but by themſelves upon one another : If theſe teſtimonies had been by any of our ſide, I could not have expected credit, but being by Proteſtants themſelves, I cannot ſee how it ſhould be denied.

Luther *confeſſeth, ſaith the learned* Proteſtant Hoſpinian, *that* he was taught by the devil, that the Maſſe was naught, and overcome with the devils reaſons, he aboliſht it : *a*

The ſame confeſſed by himſelfe : *b* I ingeniouſly confeſſe (ſaith *Luther*) that I cannot (henceforth) place *Zwinglius* in the number of Chriſtians, *c* *and further he affirmes that* he had loſt whole Chriſt. *d* *Zwinglius* (*ſaith Schluſſelburg*) after the manner of all Hereticks was ſtricken with the ſpirit of giddineſſe, and blindneſſe; deriving it from the etimologie of his name, *in dutch, von dem Schwindel.* *e*

Gualterus *calls* Zwinglius, the Author of War, the diſturber of peace, proud and cruell ; *and inſtances in his ſtrange attempt againſt* the Tygurines, his fellows, *whom he forced* by want, and famine, to follow his doctrine ; *and that* he dyed in armor, and in the Warre. *f*

And Luther *ſaith,* he dyed like a thiefe, becauſe he would compell others to his error. *g*

And he ſaith further, that he denyed Chriſt and is damn'd. *h*

He tells us alſo, that the devill or the devills dam, uſed to appeare to Caroloſe, and taught him the expoſition of, *this is my body.* *(i)* *As alſo that* he poſſeſſed him corporally ; *and that* he was poſſeſſed with more devils then one. *k* *Neither would he have any man* wonder that he calls him devill : *for he ſaith* he hath nothing to doe with him : but has onely relation to him, by whom he

is

a Hiſt. Sacr. part ult. f. 131.
b Tom. 7. Wit. fol. 228.
c Tom. 2. Germ. fol. 190.
d In fol. 182.
e Lin. 2 act. 1.
f In apolog. pro *Zwing.* 1 tom. fol. 30, 31. and *Oſiander* Epiſt. Cent. 16. p. 203.
g Luther collog. lat. tom. 2. c. de Adverſ.
h Luth. col. lat. tom. 1. c. de dam. & inferno.
i Tom. 3. Jen. *Germ.* f. 68. ſo *Chemnitius* de cœna p. 214.
k Luther loc. com. claſſ. 5. c. 15. p. 47.

is obſeſt, who ſpeaks by him. (*l*) *The laſt apparition of the devill to him, which was* three dayes before his death, *is recorded by* Albert. *m*

If you look into Bezas Epigrams, *printed at* Paris, An. 1548. *you will find pretty paſſages concerning* his boy *Andebers, and* his wench Candida; *and the buſineſſe debated at large, concerning* which ſin is to be preferr'd; *and his* chuſing the boy *at laſt.*

Scluſſelberg *ſaid, that* Peter Martyr was a heretick, and dyed ſo. *n*

Nicolaus Selneverus *ſaid, that Oecolampadius*, in his doctrine built upon the ſand. *o And*

(*Saith* Luther) *Emſer:* and *Oecolampadius*, and ſuch like, were hiddenly ſlain by thoſe horrible blowes and ſhakings of the devill. *p*

Simlerus *ſaith*, that *Brentius Miricus*, and *Andrew Muſculus*, in their writings, did nothing elſe but make way for the devill. *q*

Luther (*ſaith* Calvin) was infected with many vices; I would he had been more carefull in correcting his vices. *r*

God, for the ſin of pride, (wherewith *Luther* exalted himſelf) took away his true ſpirit. *ſ*

We have found (*ſaith* Oecalompadius) in the faith and confeſſion of *Luthers* 12. *Articles*, whereof ſome are more vaine then is fitting; ſome leſſe faithfull, and over-guilefully expounded; others again are falſe, and reprobate; but ſome there are which plainly diſſent from the Word of God, and the Articles of Chriſtian faith. *t*

Thou O *Luther*, ſaith *Zwinglius*, corrupteſt and adultereſt the Scriptures, imitating therein the *Marcioniſts*, and the *Arians*. *u*

l Luth. tom. 3. Jen. fol. 61.

m Cont. Carloſt. fol. 6. See Jo. Schutzl. 50 cauſ. c. 50.

n Theol. Calv. l. 2. act. 1.

o Seln. part. c. Enarrat. ger. in Pſal. f. 225.

p Luth. tom. 7. fol. 30.

q Siml. in vita Bulling. fol. 55.

r Calv. alledged by Schluſſelb. theol. cal. lib. 2. fol. 126.

ſ Cont. Rheg. l. Germ. cont. Jo. Heſſ. de cœna domini.

t Oecol. reſp. ad. Luth. confeſſ. See Zuenckfeld. præf. ſuper præcept. fidei artic. & Hoſpin. hiſt. Sacra part 2. fol. 5.

u Zwing. tom. 2. fol. 412.

In tranſlating and expounding of Scripture, *Luthers* errors are many, and manifeſt. *w*

w Bucer dial. Conc. *Melanct.*

Zwinglius *tells us, that* Luther affirms ſometimes this, and ſometimes that, of one and the ſame thing, that he is never at one with himſelf; *taxing him with* inconſtancy, and lightneſſe in the word of God. *a*

a Zwing. tom. 2. fol. 458.

That he cares not what he ſaith, though he be found contradicting the Oracles of God. *b*

b Zwing. tom. 2. reſp. ad confeſ. *Luth.*

As ſure as God is God, ſo ſure, and deviliſh a lyer is *Luther*. *c*

c Jo. Camp. colloq. lat. *Luth.* Tom. 2. c. de adv. f. 354.

Luthers writings containe nothing, but railing and reproaches: inſomuch that it maketh the Proteſtant Religion ſuſpected, and hated. *d*

d Tigur. confeſſ. Orthod. fol. 122, 123.

He calls an anointed King, Hen. 8. *of* England, a furious dolt, indued with an impudent and whoriſh face, without a vein of princely bloud in his whole body; a lying Sophiſt; a damnable rotten worm, a baſilisk, the progeny of an Adder; ſcurrilous lyer, covered with a title of a King; a clown, a block-head; fooliſh, wicked, and impudent *Henry*: *and ſaies, that* he lies like a ſcurrilous knave: and thou lieſt in thy throat, fooliſh and ſacrilegious King. *e*

e Luth. Tom. 2. fol. 333, 334, 335. 338. 340.

Nor did he leſſe raile at other Princes; as at the Duke of Brunſwick, *in his Booke called* Wider hans worſt, *written purpoſely againſt him, as alſo againſt the Biſhop of* Mentz, *one of the Princes Electors. f And againſt the Princes of* Germany. *g*

f Tom. 3. Germ. fol. 533. 339. 360. *g* Tom. 2. Germ. fol. 190. 200.

No marvaile that he ſaith, that he had eaten a peck or two of Salt with the Devill; and that he knew the Devill very well, and that the Devill knew him againe. *h*

h Luth. conc. de turb. ſedant.

No marvaile that he confeſſed of himſelfe, that the Devill ſometimes paſſed through his brains. *i*

i Tom. 3. Jen. Germ. fol. 485.

No marvaile that he ſaid, the Devill did more frequently

quently ſleep with him, and cling to him cloſer, then his Catharine. *k*

No marvaile that he ſaid that the Devil walked with him in his bed-chamber; and that he had one or two wonderfull Devils, by whom he was diligently and carefully ſerved: and they no ſmal Devils, but great ones; yea, Doctors of divinity, amongſt the Devils. *l*

No marvaile that his fellow Prot. *could* wonder how marvelouſly he bewrayed himſelfe with his Devils; and that he could uſe ſuch filthy words, ſo repleniſhed with all the Devils in Hell. *m*

No marvaile that they ſaid that, never any man writ more filthily, more uncivilly, more lewdly, and beyond all bounds of Chriſtian modeſty, *then did* Luther. *n*

No marvel that he is ſo taxed for his obſcenity *in his* Henzius Anglicus, againſt King *Hen.* the eight, *for his* beaſtlineſſe *in his* Hans worſt againſt the Jewes: *for his* filthy mentioning of Hogs; for his ſtincking repetition of turds and dunghils, *in his* Schemhamphoriſe: *But if you will hear of his Maſter-piece, you maſt read the Book which he writ againſt the Pope; where he asks him,* out of what mouth (O Pope) doſt thou ſpeak, is it out of that from whence thy farts doe burſt? If it come thence, keep it to thy ſelfe: if it comes from that wherein thou powreſt thy Coriſca wine, let the Dog fill that with his excrements; good Aſſe doe not kick; kick not my little Pope: O my dear Aſſe, doe not ſo: fie how this little Pope hath bewrayed himſelfe. *o*

Is this the way to win to his ſide? or to gaine ſouls to Chriſt? or to reforme Churches? or to confute hereſies? It is obſerved, that Saint Paul *in his Epiſtles repeated the ſacred name of Jeſus* 500 *times, and it is the obſerva-*

k Luth. Colloq. mens Germ. fol. 281.

l Luth. 16. fol. 275.

m Tigur. tract. 3. cont. ſupra. *Luth.* confeſſio.

n Tigur. theol. Orthod. confeſſ. fol. 10.

o Luth. cont. pontif. *Rom.* adiab. fund. in tom. 8. Jen. p. 207, 208.

tion of the learned Tygurin Divines, *that ſo many times* Luther *hath uſed the name of Devill in his Bookes: and it is no marvaile that they burſt out into this admiration*; How wonderfull is *Luther* here, with his Devils! what impure words he uſeth, with how many Devils doth he burſt? *p*

Nor marvail that Zwinglius *ſaith to him*, we fill not our Books with ſo many Devils, nor doe we bring ſo many armies of Devils againſt thee. *q*

If you can expect to gather figgs from thorns, or grapes from thiſtles, *then ye may expect words from a ſanctified ſpirit, to proceed from ſuch a mouth, elſe not.*

What ſhould I ſay more? Melanćthon *tells us, that* Caroloſtadius was a barbarous fellow; without wit, without learning, without common ſenſe; in whom was no ſigne of the holy Ghoſt: but manifeſt tokens of impiety. *r*

Laſtly, Hutterus Beza's *owne fellow Proteſtant, thus ſaies of him, and caſts this dirt in his face, which is ſo ſhameleſſe a teſtimony, that you muſt give me leave to throw a latine vail over it*, viz. Beza in fine libri, de abſentia corporis Chriſti in cœna ſcribit; Candidæ, ſive Amaſcæ ſuæ, culum, imo partem diverſam, magis adhuc pudendam, mundiora eſſe, quam illorum ora, qui ſimpliciter verbis Chriſti inherentes, credant ſe præſens Chriſti Corpus in cœna ſacra, ore ſuo accipere. *ſ*

And another: Beza, by his moſt filthy manners, was a diſgrace to honeſt Diſcipline; who in ſacrilegious verſe publiſhed to the world, his deteſtable loves, his unlawfull carnall acts, whoredoms, and fowl adulteries: not content that himſelfe onely ſhould like a hog wallow in the durt of wicked luſts, but he muſt alſo pollute the eais of ſtudious youth with his filth. *t*

p Theol. Tigur. confeſſ. Germ. fol. 3. & part 3. fol. 114.

q Zwing. tom. 2. fol. 381.

r Melanćt. Epiſt. ad Freder. micon. Hoſp. hiſt. Sac.

ſ Hut. explic. lib. concord. art. 7. p. 703.

t Tilm. Heſhuſ. Ver. & Sanc. Conf.

I could inlarge my Paper to a volume of like inſtances in others, but theſe are the prime reformers of the Proteſtant Churches: and how the people edified under their Doctrine; theſe Narratives from their owne mouths ſhall tell you.

When we were ſeduced by the *Pope (ſaith Luther)* every man did willingly follow good works: and now every man neither ſaith, nor knoweth any thing, but how to get all to himſelfe, by exactions, pillage, theft, lying, uſury. *u*

u Luth. Dom. 26. poſt Trin. See Mr. *Stubs* motive to good works p. 44, 45.

Certainly, to ſpeak the truth, there is many times found Conſcionable, and plainer dealing amongſt moſt Papiſts, then among many Proteſtants. And if we look narrowly to the ages paſt, we ſhall find more godlineſſe, devotion and zeal, (though blind) more love, one toward another, more fidelity and faithfulneſſe, every way in them, then is now to be found in us. *a*

a Maſter *Stubs* motive, pag. 43.

If any man be deſirous to ſee a great rabble of knaves, of perſons turbulent, deceitfull, Coſoners, Uſurers, let him goe to any City, where the Goſpel is purely preached, and he ſhall find them there by multitudes. For it is more manifeſt then the day light, that there were never among the *Ethnicks*, *Turks*, or infidels more unbridled, and unruly perſons, with whom all virtue and honeſty is quite extinct, then are amongſt the Profeſſonrs of the Goſpel. *b*

b Andr. Muſcul. Domin. 1. Adv. See him alſo lib. de Prophet. & Sim. Paulus in Serm. Dom. 13. poſt Trinit.

The children of them of the reformed Goſpel grow every day worſe, more untractable, and dare commit ſuch crimes, as men of former times were never ſubject to. *c*

c Jo. Wygand. l. de bon. & mal. Germ.

If you caſt your eyes upon Proteſtant Doctours, you ſhall find that ſome of them moved through vaine glory, envious zeal, and a prejudicate opinion, diſorder the true Doctrine, diſperſe, and earneſtly defend the

falſe; ſome of them without cauſe ſtir up contentions, and with inconſiderate ſpight defend them: many wreſt their Doctrines every way, of purpoſe to pleaſe their Princes, and the people: by whoſe grace and favour they are maintained: they overthrow with their wicked life, all that they had formerly built with their true doctrine. *d*

d Paul Eber. præfat. comm. *Philippi.* in Epiſt. ad *Cor.*

How could the people be better, when their Miniſters were ſo bad? like lips, like lettice. I will conclude all with the learned Proteſtant, Zanchius, *and then you will neither wonder at one or other*; I have read *(ſaith he)* the Latine copy of the Apology, and diligently read it over, not without choller, when I perceived what manner of writing, very many (let me not ſay for the moſt part, but all) doe uſe, in the Churches of the reformed Goſpel, who would ſeeme (notwithſtanding) to be Paſtors, Doctors, and Pillars of the Church.

The ſtate of the queſtion, that it may not be underſtood, we often, (of ſet purpoſe) over-cloud with darkneſſe: things which are manifeſt, we impudently deny: things falſe, we (without ſhame) avouch: things plainly impious, we propoſe as the firſt principles of faith: things orthodoxall, we condemne of hereſie: Scripture at our pleaſure, we detort to our owne dreams: we boaſt of Fathers, when we will follow nothing leſſe then their doctrine: to deceive, to calumniate, to raile, is familiar with us: ſo as we may defend our cauſe, good or bad, by right or by wrong; all other things we turne upſide down: Oh times, Oh manners! *e*

e Zanch. epiſt. ad Jo. Sturm. this in fine, l. 7. & 8. *Miſcellan.*

It is no marvel that M. Sutcliff, *ſaies, that* the Proteſtant writers offered great violence to the Scriptures, expounding them contrary both to antient Fathers, Hiſtory, and common reaſon. *f*

f Sutclif. anſw. Cal. per. p. 141.

It

It is no marvel that Cambden *tells us, that* Holland is a fruitfull province of heretiques: *g*

g Elizab. p. 300

It is no marvell that Your royall Father tells us, that both Hungary, and *Bohemia,* abound with infinite varieties of ſects. *h*

b K. *James* his Works, p. 371

It is no marvell, that he ſaid he could never ſee a Bible well tranſlated into Engliſh; and that the worſt of all was the *Geneva,* whereunto were added notes, untrue, ſeditious, and ſavouring too much of dangerous, and traiterous conceits. *i*

i Page 45, 46.

It is no marvel that He proteſted before the great God, that you ſhould never find among the *Highland*, or Border-theeves, greater ingratitude, more lies, and vile perjuries, then with thoſe phanatick ſpirits. *k*

k K. *James* his Works, p. 168.

It is no marvel that M. Bancroft *ſaid that* the Puritans of *Scotland*, were publiſhed in a Declaration by his Majeſtie, to be unnaturall Subjects, ſeditious, troubleſome, and unquiet ſpirits, members of Sathan, enemies to the King, and the Common-wealth of their owne native Country. *l*

l Dang. poſit. 22.

And laſtly, becauſe your Church of England *moſt followed* Calvins *doctrine of any of the reſt, I ſhall ſhew you what end he made, anſwerable to his beginning, and courſe of life, written by two knowne and approved* Proteſtant *Authors, viz.* God in the rod of his fury, viſiting *Calvin*, did horribly puniſh him, before the fearfull hour of his unhappy death; for he ſo ſtruck this heretick with his mighty hand, that being in deſpair, and calling upon the Devill, he gave up his wicked ſoule, ſwearing curſing, and blaſpheming, dying upon the diſeaſe of lyce and wormes, increaſing in a moſt loathſome ulcer about his privie parts, ſo as none preſent could endure the ſtench;

ſtentch; theſe things are objected unto *Calvin* in publick writing, in which alſo horrible things are declared concerning his laſciviouſneſſe, his ſundry abominable vices, and Sodomiticall luſts, for which laſt he was by the Magiſtrate (at Nayon) under whom he lived branded on the ſhoulder with a hot borning iron; *And this is ſaid of him by* Schlusberg. (*m*) *She which is likewiſe confirmed by* Jo. Herennius. *n*

m Theolog. *Calviniſt.* lib. 2. fol. 72.

n li. de vita *Calvini.*

It may be your Majeſtie may taxt me of bitterneſſe, or for the diſcovery of nakedneſſe. But I hope you will give me leave to look what ſtaffe I leane upon when I am to looke down upon ſo great and terrible a precipice as Hell, and to conſider the rottenneſſe of the ſeverall rounds of that ladder, which is propoſed to me for my aſcent unto heaven, and to forewarne others of the dangers I eſpie; their owne words can be none of my railing: nor their owne accuſations, my errour: except it be a fault, to take notice, of what is publiſhed, and make uſe of what I ſee: Ex ore tuo *was our Saviours rule, and ſhall be mine. There hath not been uſed one Catholick Author throughout the accuſation, and I take it to be the providenee of God, that they ſhould be thus infatuated, as to accuſe one another, that good men may take heed how they rely upon ſuch mens Judgements, in order to their eternall Salvation.*

As to Your Majeſties Objection, that we of the Church of Rome *fell away from our ſelves, and that you did not fall away from us, as alſo to the common ſaying of all Proteſtants, bidding us to returne to our ſelves, and they will returne to us, we accept of their offer, we will doe ſo; that is to ſay, we will hold our ſelves to the ſame Doctrine, which the Church of* Rome *held, before ſhe converted this Nation to Chriſtianity, and then they cannot ſay, we fell away from them, or from our ſelves, whilſt we maintaine the ſame Doctrin*

ctrine we held before you were of us: that is to ſay, whilſt we maintain'd the ſame Doctrine that we maintained during the four firſt Councels, acknowledged by moſt Proteſtants, and during Saint Auguſt. *time concerning whom* Luther *himſelf acknowledged, That* after the ſacred Scriptures, there is no Doctor of the Church to be compared, (*a*) *thereby excluding himſelf and all his aſſociates from being preferr'd before him, concerning whom Maſter* Field *of the Church writes, that Saint* Aug. was the greateſt Father *ſince the Apoſtles.* (*b*) *Concerning whom* Covel *writes, that* he did ſhine in learning above all that ever did, or will appear. (*c*) *Concerning whom* Jewell *appeals, as to* a true and Orthodox Doctor. (*d*) *Concerning whom Mr.* Forreſter. Non. Teſſagraph. *calls him* the Fathers Monarch. *e And*

Concerning whom Gomer *acknowledges his opinion to be* moſt pure. *f*

Concerning whom Maſter Whitaker *doubts not, but that* he was a Proteſtant. (*g*) *And laſtly, concerning whom your royall Father ſeemed to appeal, when he objected unto Card.* Peron, *That* the face and exteriour form of the Church was changed ſince his time, and far different to what it was in his dayes, *wherefore we will take a view of what it was* then, *and ſee whether we loſe or keep our ground, and whether it be the ſame which you acknowledged* then *to be ſo firm.*

Our Church believed then a true and reall preſence, and the orall manducation of the body of Chriſt, in the Sacrament, as the prince of the Sacramentarians acknowledged (*a*) *in theſe words* from the time of S. *Auguſtin,* which was for the ſpace of twelve hundred yeares, the opinion of corporall fleſh, had already got the maſtery. *And in this quality* ſhe adored the *Eucariſt,* (*b*) with out-

a Luth. loc. com. Claſſ. 4. p. 45.

b lib. 3. fol. 170.

c. Covel. in his anſw. to *Jo. Burges.*

d In his challenge at *Pauls* Croſſe.

e In proem. p. 3.

f Gom. ſpec. veræ Eccleſ.

g Whit. anſw. to f. Camp. in the cont. fol. 2. parag. 28.

a Zwingl. lib. de vera & falſa relig. cap. de Euchariſt.

b Chryſ. in 1. Cor. Hom. 24.

outward geſtures and adoration, *as* the true and proper body of Chriſt. Then the Church believed the body of Chriſt to be in the Sacrament [c]; even beſides the time that it was in uſe: *And for this cauſe* kept it after Conſecration, for Domeſticall Communions [d], to give to the ſick [e], to carry upon the Sea [f], to ſend into far Provinces [g].

Then ſhe believed that Communion under both kinds was not neceſſary for the ſufficiency of participation, but that all the body, and all the bloud was taken in either kind: *And for this cauſe*, in Domeſticall Communions, in Communions for children, for ſick perſons by Sea, and at the hour of death it was diſtributed under one kind, onely. [h]

Then *the Church believed* [i], that the *Euchariſt* was a true, full, and intire ſacrifice; not onely *Euchariſticall*, but [k] propitiatory; and offered it as well for the living [l] as the dead. *The faithfull and devout people of the Church* then made pilgrimages to [m] the bodies of the Martyrs [n]; pray'd to the Martyrs to pray to God for them [o]: Celebrated their Feaſts [p], reverenced their Reliques in all honourable forms. And when they had received help from God, by the interceſſion of the ſaid Martyrs [q], they hung up in the Temples, and upon the Altars, erected to their memory, images of thoſe parts of their bodies that had been healed.

The Church then *held* [r] the Apoſtolicall traditions, to be equall to the Apoſtolicall writings; and held for Apoſtolicall traditions, *all that the Church of* Rome *now embraceth under that Title: She* then offered prayers for the dead [ſ], *both* publick and private, *to the end to procure for them*, eaſe and reſt: *And held this cuſtome as a* thing [t] neceſſary for the refreſhment of their ſouls. *The Church*

c Cyrill. Alex. Ep. ad Cæſar. par.
d Cypr. de lapſu.
e Euſeb. hiſt. lib. 7.
f Ambr. de obiit Sayer.
g Euſeb. hiſt. lib. 1.
h Paulin. in vita Ambr. Tertul. ad ux. c. 55. Baſil. Epiſt. ad Cæſar. pat.
i Cypr. ad Cæcil ep. 63.
k Euſeb. de vita Conſt. l. 4.
l Chryſ. in 1 Cor. hom 41.
m Baſil. in 40. Martyrs.
n Ambr. de vid.
o Aug. in Pſal. 63. and 88.
p Hier. and Marcell. ep. 17.
q Theod. de Gr. aff. l. 8.
r Baſil. de Sanct. Spirit.
ſ Tertul. de mon. Aug. de verb. Ap.
t Aug. de cura pro mort.

Church then *held the faſt* [u] *of the forty dayes of Lent for a cuſtome, not* free, *but* neceſſary, *and of* Apoſtolicall tradition. *And out of the time of* Pentecoſt *faſted all the* Frydayes in the year in memory of the death of Chriſt, *except Chriſtmay-Day fell on a Fryday* [w], *which ſhe then excepted as an* Apoſtolicall tradition: *The Church* then *held* [x] *marriage after the vow of Virginity to be a* ſin: *and reputed* [y] *thoſe, who married together after their vowes, not onely for* adulterers, *but alſo for* inceſtuous perſons.

The Church held then [z] *mingling of water with wine in the ſacrifice of the* Eucharift, *for a thing* neceſſary, and of Divine, and Apoſtolicall tradition. *She held* then [a] *exorciſmes, exſufflations, and renunciations, which are made in Batiſme, for* ſacred Ceremonies, *and of* Apoſtolicall tradition: *She held* then [b], *beſides Batiſme and the* Eucharift, Confirmation [c], Marriage [d], Orders, and extream Unction, *for* true and proper Sacraments *which the Church of* Rome *now acknowledgeth: The Church, in the Ceremonies of Baptiſme, uſed* then [g] oyl, [b] ſalt, [i] wax-lights, [k] exorciſmes, [l] the ſigne of the Croſs, [m] *the word* Ephata, *and other that accompany it, none of them without reaſon, and excellent ſignification. The Church held* then [n] *Baptiſme for infants of* abſolute neceſſity: *and for this cauſe then permitted,* [o] lay men to baptiſe in danger of death, *the Church uſed* then *holy water,* conſecrated by certain words and Ceremonies: *and made uſe of it both* for Baptiſme, [p] *and* [q] againſt inchantments, *and to make* [r] exorciſmes, and conjurations againſt evill ſpirits.

The Church held then *divers degrees in the Eccleſiaſticall Regiment, to wit,* [ſ] Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, Subdeacons, the Acolite, Exorciſt, Reader and Porter *conſecrated and bleſſed them with divers* Forms and Ceremonies: *And in the Epiſcopall Order acknowledged, divers*

u Hier. ad Marcell. ep. 54.
w Epiph. in Compen.
x Epiph. Cont. Apoſt. Hæreſ. 51.
y Chryſ. ad Theod. Hier. Cont. Jov. l. 1.
z Cypr. Cæcil. epiſt. 63.
a Aug. de pec. orig. cap. 40.
b Aug. Cont. Pet. l. 3. c. 4.
c Aug. de nupt. & Conc. c. 17.
d Ambr. de pænit. c. 7.
e Leo 1. epiſt.
f Aug Cont. Parm. l. 2. c. 13.
g Cyp. epiſt. 70.
h Conc. Carth. 3. cap. 5.
i Greg. Naz. de bapt.
k Aug. ep. 10.
l Aug. Cont. Jul. l. 6. c. 8.
m Ambr. de ſacr. l. 1.
n Aug. de an. & evis orig. l. 3. c. 15.
o Tert. de bapt.
p Baſil. de S. Spirit. c. 17.
q Epiph. hær. 30
r Theod. Hiſt. Eccleſ. l. 5. c. 3.
ſ Concil. Laod. c. 24. Concil. Carth. 4. 6. 2.

seats of Jurisdiction of positive right; *to wit*, Archbishops, Primates, Patriarchs, *and* [h] *one* Supereminent (*by Divine law*) *which was the* Pope, *without whom* nothing could be decided, appertaining to the universall Church; *and* the want of whose presence, either by himselfe, or his Legats, or his Confirmation, made all Councels (*pretended to be universall*) unlawfull.

In the Church then *the service was said throughout the East*, in Greek, *and throughout the West* [k], *as well in* Africa, *as in* Europe, *in* Latin: *although that in none of the provinces* (*except in* Italy, *and the Cities, where the* Romane *Colonies resided*) *the Latine tongue, was* understood by the common people. *She observed* then *the* distinction of feasts [l] *and* ordinary dayes, *the Distinction of* [l] Ecclesiasticall and lay habits: *the* [m] *reverence of* sacred vessels, *the custome of* [n] shaming *and* [o] unction *for the* collation of orders; *the Ceremony of the* [p] *Priest*, washing his hands at the Altar, *before the consecration of the Mysteries*. *She* then [q] *pronounced a part of the service, at the Altar with* a low voice, *made* [r] processions with the reliques of Martyrs [s] kissed them [t], *carried them* in clothes of silke, *and* vessels of gold [u], took *and* esteemed the dust from under their reliquaries: accompanied the dead to their sepulchres, *with* [w] wax tapers *in sign of joy, for the certainty of* their future resurrection. *The Church* then *had the picture of Christ, and of his Saints, both* [x] out of Churches, [y] *and* in them: *and upon* the very [z] Altars, (*not to adore them with God-like worship*) *but* by them, *to* reverence the Souldiers and Champions of Christ.

The faithfull then *used the* [a] *sign of the Crosse*, in all their Conversations [b], painted it on the portal of all the houses of the faithfull [c]; *gave* their blessing *to the people with* their hand, *by the signe of* the Crosse [d], *imployed*

it

[h] Hier. ad Damasc. Ep. 57. Concil. Chal. ep. ad Leon.
[i] Hier. præf. in paralip.
[k] Aug. Epist. 57. de Doct. Christ. lib. 2. cap. 13.
[l] Aug. Epist. 118. & Pial. 63. & 38.
[l] Hier. ad He. Ep. 3. Theod. Hist. Eccles. l. 2. c. 27.
[m] Op. l. 1. p. 19.
[n] Theod. Hist. l. 5. c. 8. Isid. de Div off. l. 1. c. 4.
[o] Greg. Naz. de pac. or. 1.
[p] Cyril. Hier. Cat. Mat. 5.
[q] Co. Laod. c. 9.
[r] Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 2. c. 8.
[s] Hier co. Vigil.
[t] Hier. co. Vigil.
[u] Hier. c. Vigil.
[w] Greg. Naz. in Jul. orat. 2.
[x] Euseb. de Vita Const.
[y] Paulin Epist. 12. Basil. in Martyr. Bar.
[z] Prudent. in S. Cassian.
[a] Tert. de coron. milit.
[b] Cyril. Cont. Jul. l. 6.
[c] Hier. in Vit. Hil.
[d] Athan. cont. Idol.

it to drive away evill ſpirits, [e] *propoſed in Jeruſalem* the very Croſſe to be adored on good Friday: *Finally, the Church held* then [f] *that* to the Catholick Church onely belongs the keeping of the Apoſtolicall tradition, *the Authority of* interpretation of Scripture; *and* the deciſion of Controverſies of faith; *and that out of the ſucceſſion* [g] of her communion, *of* [h] her Doctrine [i] *and* her miniſtery, *there was* neither Church, *nor* Salvation.

Neither will I inſiſt with you onely upon the word, then, *but* before, *and* before, *and* before *that, even to the* firſt *age of all, will I ſhew you our doctrine of the reall preſence, and holy Sacrifice of the Maſſe; Invocation of Saints; Veneration of Reliques and Images, Confeſſion, and Prieſtly abſolution; Purgatory and prayer for the dead; Traditions, &c.*

In the fift Age, or hundred of years, Saint Auguſtine *was for the* reall and corporall preſence. [a]

In the fourth Age, Saint Ambroſe. [b]

In the third Age Saint Cyprian. [c]

In the ſecond Age, or hundred of years, S. Irenæus. [d]

And in the firſt Age [e] *Saint* Ignatius, *Martyr, and Diſciple of Saint* John *the Evangeliſt.*

Concerning the honour and invocation of Saints, *In the fifth Age we find Saint* Auguſtine, [f] *praying to the* Virgin Mary, *and other Saints.*

In the fourth Age, we find Greg. Naz. *praying to S.* Baſil *the great.* [g]

In the third Age, we find S. Origen, praying to Father *Abraham.* [h]

In the ſecond Age, Juſtin Martyr. [i]

And in the firſt age, in the Liturgy of S. James *the leſſe.* [k]

For the uſe *and* veneration of holy Reliques *and* Images, *and chiefly of the* Holy Croſſe; *in the fifth age, Saint* Auguſtine. [l]

[e] Paul Ep. 11.
[f] Tert. de præſcript. Iren. l. 3. c. 3. & l. 4. c. 32.
[g] Cypr. de unit. Eccleſ. Conc. Car. 4. c. 1.
[h] Hier. Cont. Lucif. Aug. de util. cred. c. 8.
[i] Cypr. ad pub. Ep. 63. ad mag. Ep. 67. Hier. ad Tit. c. 3.
[a] Aug. Conc. 1. in Pſal. 33.
[b] Lib. 4. de Sacra. c. 5. and l. de iis, qui miſteriis initiantur, c. 9.
[c] Serm. de Cœna Dom. prope init.
[d] l. 4. c. 32. infin.
[e] Ep. ad ſmirnum. ut cit. a Theod. Dial. 3.
[f] Serm. de Verb. Apoſt. prope init. & medit. c. 40. & l. de loquutionibus in gen. prope finē.
[g] In Orat. 20. quæ eſt in laudem. in Baſil. mag. and Saint Hier. Cont Vigil. 13. initio.
[h] Initio ſui lamenti.
[i] Apol. 2. ad Anton. pium. Imper. non longe ab initio.
[k] Ante Med.
[l] Tract. 118. in Joan fine.

In the fourth Age Athanaſius. *m*
In the third Age Origen. *n*
In the ſecond Age St. Juſtin Martyr. *o*
And in the firſt Age S. Ignatius. *p*
Concerning Confeſſion *and* Abſolutions: *In the fifth Age S.* Auguſt. *q*
In the fourth Age S. Baſil. *the Great.* r
In the third Age S. Cypr. *ſ*
In the ſecond Age Tertull. *t*
And in the firſt Age S. Clement. *u*
Now concerning Purgatory, *and* Prayer *for the dead in the fifth Age S.* Auguſtin. *a*
In the fourth Age S. Ambroſe. *b*
In the third Age S. Cypr. *c*
In the ſecond Age Tertull. *d*
And in the firſt Age S. Clement. *e*
Concerning Traditions *in the fifth Age S.* Aug. *f*
In the fourth Age S. Baſil. *g*
In the third Age S. Epiphanins. *h*
In the ſecond Age S. Irenæus. *i*
And in the firſt Age S. Dennis. *k*

Now ſuppoſe that all theſe quotations be right. The ſaving of a ſoul, of your own ſoul, of the ſoul of a King, of the ſouls of ſo many Kingdoms: and the gaining of that Kingdome for a reward, (which in compariſon of theſe Earthly ones (for which you ſo often fight, ſo much ſtrive, and labour ſo much for to obtain) your tetrarchate would be a gain for you to loſe it, ſo that you might but obtain that) would be worth the ſearch; and when you have found them to be truly cited, I dare truſt your judgement, that it will tell you, that we have not changed our Countenance, nor fled our Colours, nor fallen away, nor altered our Religion, nor forſaken our firſt Love, nor denyed our Principles, nor brought Novel-

ties

m Ad Antiochum princip.
n Hom. 8. in diverſos Evangelii locos.
o Ad quæſt. 28. Gentilium.
p Epiſt ad Phil. ante Med.
q Hom. 49. ante Med.
r Sui regulis brevior. interr. 288.
ſ Ser. de lapſis.
t l. de pœn. c. 10
u Clement Rom. Epiſt. 1.
a De Civ. Dei, l. 26. c 24. and alſo Ser. 41. de ſanct. propè init. alſo Ser. 22. de Verb. Apoſt.
b Ambr. in 1 Cor. 3. S. Hier. in Com. in c. 11. prove. b.
c Ep. 5. ad Ant. poſt. med.
d l. de animæ c. 58. de Corona milit. c. 3. 4.
l Clem. Rom. Ep. 1. de S Petr. propè fin.
f l 4. de bapt. Con. Donat. c. 24.
g lib. de Sp. Sancto. c. 27.
h Hereſ. 61.
i lib. 3. cap. 4.
k Areopag. c. 1. Eccleſ. Hierar.

ties into the Church, (*but that we doe* antiquum obtinere) *whereby we ſhould be forſaken of you, for forſaking our ſelves: but rather that we ſhould win you unto us, by being ſtill the ſame, we were when we won you firſt unto us, and were at the beginning. And is it for the honeur of the* Engliſh *Nation, famous for the firſt Chriſtian King, and the firſt Chriſtian Emperour, to forſake her Mother Church, ſo renowned for antiquity, and to annex their Religion as a codicell to an appeal of a company of Proteſters, againſt a* decree at Spira *? and to forſake ſo glorious a name as* Catholick, *and to take a name upon them, wherein they had neither right nor intereſt; and* then *to take* meaſure *of the* Scottiſh *Diſcipline for the* new faſhion *of their ſouls, and to make to themſelves* poſies *of the* weedings *of that* Garden, *into which* Chriſt *himſelf* came down [a], *upon which both the* north and ſouth-winds do blow [b], *in which is* a well of living waters *and* ſtreams from Lebanon [c]: *about which is* an encloſure *of* brotherly affection [d]. *Will you forſake* the Roſe of Sharon, *and* the Lillie of the Vallies *for ſuch a* Noſe-gay *? For I ſhall make it apparent unto your Majeſty, that the Doctrines which Proteſtants now hold, as in oppoſition unto us, were but ſo many* condemned *hereſies, by the* Antient *and* Orthodoxall *Fathers of the Church, and never oppoſed by any of them: As for example, Proteſtants hold that the Church may* Erre; *this they had from the* Donatiſts, *for which they were frequently reproved by St.* Auguſtin. [e]

Proteſtants deny unwritten traditions, *and urge* Scripture *onely. This they had from the* Arrians, *who were* condemned *for it by St.* Epiphanius, *and S.* Auguſtin, *both* [f].

Proteſtants teach, that Prieſts may Marry; *this they had from* Vigilantius, *who is condemned for it by St.* Hieronimus [g].

[a] Cant. 6. 1.
[b] Cant. 4. 16.
[c] Cant. 4. 15.
[d] Cant. 4. 12. Cant. 2. 1.
[e] Paſſim, cont. Donat.
[f] Epiph. Her. 75. Aug. cont. maxim. l. 1. c. 2. & ult.
[g] Con. Vigilan. c. 1.

Pro

Proteſtants deny prayer for the dead : *this they had from* Arrius, *for which he is* condemned *by Saint* Auguſt: *and* Epiphanius *both.* d

d Aug. hær. 53. Epiph. hær. 75.

Proteſtants deny Invocation of Saints : *this they had from* Vigilantius, *for which he was* condemned *by Saint* Hieron. e

e Hier. Con. Vigil. c. 3.

Proteſtants deny Reverence to Images : *this they had from* Xenias, *for which he is* reproved *by* Nicephorus. f

f Hiſt. l. 16. c. 27 and 55.

Proteſtants deny the reall Preſence : *this they had from the* Carpenaites, *who were, ſaith Saint* Auguſtin, *the firſt Hereticks, that denied the* reall Preſence : *and that* Judas *was the firſt* Suborner *and* Maintainer of this hereſie. g

g Aug. in Pſal.

Proteſtants deny Confeſſion of ſins *to a* Prieſt : *ſo did the* Novatian *Hereticks, and the* Montaniſts, *for which they are* reproved *by Saint* Ambroſe *and Saint* Hieron. h

h Ambr. li. de pœnit. c. 7. Hier. Epiſt. ad Marcel. 54.

Proteſtants ſay that they are juſtified by Faith onely : *this they had from the* pſeudo-Apoſtles, *for which they are* comdemned *by St.* Auguſtin. i

i Aug. de fide & oper. c. 14.

Laſtly, as I have ſhewed Your Majeſty, that Your Church, as it ſtands in oppoſition to ours, is but a congeries *of ſo many hereſies, to which I could eaſily make an enlargement: but that I fear, I have been too tedious already; So I ſhall make it appeare, that our Church as ſhe ſtands in oppoſition unto yours, is true and right, even* your ſelves *being witneſſes, and you ſhall find our Doctrine among your owne Doctors. Firſt the* Greek *Church, whom you court to your ſide, as indeed they are Proteſtants according to your vulgar reception, being you call all thoſe Proteſtants, who are or were in any* Oppoſition *to the Church of* Rome, *though in their Tenents* otherwiſe, *they never ſo much doe* diſagree.

For

For the Greek *Church with which you ſo often hit us in the teeth and take to be of* your *faction, ſhe holds* Invocation of Saints, Adoration of Images, Tranſubſtantiation, Cõmunion in one kind for the ſick, *and many others.*

Maſter Parker *confeſſeth, that Luther* croſſed himſelfe morning and evening, and is never ſeene to be painted praying, but before a Crucifix. *a*

As touching the Invocation of Saints *(ſaith Luther)* I think with the whole Chriſtian Church, and hold, that Saints are to be honoured by us, and invocated *b*. *I never denyed* Purgatory *(ſaith Luther)* and yet I believe it, as I have often written and confeſſed *c*. If it is lawfull, *(ſaith Luther,)* for the Jews to have the picture of Cæſar upon their Coins; much more is it lawfull for Chriſtians to have in their Churches Croſſes and Images of Mary *d*; *and laſtly he maintained the* reall Preſence. *e*

But let us goe a little further, and conſider what they held, whom ye call your Predeceſſours, *under whom ye* ſhrowd *your* Viſibility, *and on whom you* look *beyond* Luther, *for your Doctrines* Patronage, *viz. Firſt upon the* Huſſites, *who brake forth about the year* 1400. *they held* ſeven Sacraments *f*. Tranſubſtantiation *g*, the Popes primacy *h*, *and the* Maſſe *i*, *as* Fox *in his acts and monuments acknowledgeth.*

Let us goe further, and conſider Wickliffe, *(our* owne *Countrey-man,) who appeared about the year* 1370. *he maintained* holy water *k*, worſhip of Reliques, and Images *l*, Interceſſion of the bleſſed Virgin Mary *m*, *the rites and Ceremonies of* the Maſſe *n*, *all the* ſeven Sacraments *o*. *Moreover, he held Opinions contrary, and condemned both by Catholick and Proteſtants, as that if a Biſhop or Prieſt be in any mortal ſin, his* Ordaining, Conſecrating, or

a Againſt Simb. part. 1. c. 2. ſect. 30. p. 105. See Jo. Crevel. refut. Cerem. miſs. p. 188. Jo. Manl. Loc. Com. p. 636.

b Purgat. quorund. art. & in Ep. ad Georg. Spal.

c Tom. 7. fol. 132. adverſus bullam. See him alſo in diſp. Lipſ. c. de purgat. & reſolut. de indulg. Concluſ. 16. See likewiſe Zwingl. Tom. 2. fol. 378.

d Luth. in Conſolat. prolab. l. 6 See this cited forth of *Luth.* by *Haſp.* Hiſt. Sac. p. 2. f. 33.

e See Zwingl. Tom. 2. f. 375.

f p. 2. 16.

g Pag. 209.

h Pag. 217. art. 7, 8.

i Luth. in Colloq. Germ. c. de miſſa.

k Wick. de blaſphem. cap. 17.

l Idem de Euchariſt. c. 9.

m Idem in Serm. de Aſſump. Mariæ.

n Idem de apoſtaſia c. 18.

o Idem in poſtill. ſup. c. 15. Marci.

Baptizing *is of no effect* p. *He condemned* lawfull Oaths *with the Anabaptists* q. *Lastly he maintained that any Ecclesiasticall Ministers were not to have any* temporall possessions r. *This last Opinion was such* savory *Doctrine, that rather then some of those times would not hearken to* that, *they would listen to* all; *as the* greedy *appetites to Bishops Lands, make some now adayes to hearken unto* any thing, *that Cryers downe of Bishops shall* foment.

p Acts & mon. p. 96. art. 4.
q Osiand. Epist. Hist. Eccles. p. 459. art. 43.
r Act. & mon. p. 96.

To goe further yet to the Waldenses, *descended from the race of one* Waldo, *a Merchant of* Lions, *who brake out about the year* 1220. *These men held the* reall Presence s, *for which they were reproved by* Calvin. *These men extolled* the merit of voluntary poverty; *they held* Transubstantiation t, *and many other opinions which most Protestants no way allow.* u

s In Epist. 244. p. 450.
t Illyricus Catalog. Test. p. 1498.
u Idem Catalog. Test. pag. 1502.

And lastly, I shall run your pedegree to the radix, *and utmost* Derivation, *that the best read* Herauld *in the Protestant Genealogy, can run its* line, *and that is to the* Waldenses, *and to* Berengarius, *who broacht his heresie in the year* 1048. *and he held* all *the points of Doctrine that we held, onely he differed from us in the point of* Transubstantiation. *And for* this *cause they took him into the* name *and* number *of Protestants and* Reformers, *notwithstanding he presently afterwards* recanted *and died a Catholick. So it* ends, *where it never had* beginning.

Finally: if neither prescription of 1600 *years possession, and continuance of our Churches Doctrine, nor our evidence out of the* word *of* God, *nor the Fathers* witnessings *to that* evidence: *nor the* Decrees *of* Councels: *nor your owne* acknowledgments, *be sufficient to mollifie and turne your royall heart, there is no more means left for* truth, *or* me, *but I must leave it to* God, *in whose* hand *are the* hearts *of Kings.*

A N

AN ANSWER TO THE Marqueſſe of *WORCESTER* His Reply to the KINGS Paper.

Our MAJESTY *is pleaſed to wave all the Markes of the true Church, and to make recourſe unto the Scriptures.*

Anſ. 1. His MAJESTY did not wave all the Markes of the true Church, aſſigned by the Marqueſſe, but ſhewed them to be ſuch as may (without diſtinction and further explication) belong to a falſe Church. From *Jer.*44.16. His MAJESTY ſhewed that Antiquity, Succeſſion and Univerſality was alledged in defence of Idolatry. That *Demetrius* (*Acts* 19.) alledged Antiquity and Univerſality for the worſhip of *Diana*; and that * *Symmachus* alledged Antiquity as a plea for all heatheniſh Idolatry and Superſtition, *page* 47. That *Ezechiel* bids, *Be not ſtiff-necked as your fore-fathers were*, *page Ibid.* Theſe words (the place being not cited) I confeſſe, I cannot find, but there are thoſe which are equivalent, *Ez.* 20. 30. *Are yee polluted after the manner of your Fathers?*

Marqueſſe *page* 52.

* What is there alſo in His Majeſties Paper cited out of *Prudentius*, is through ſome miſtake aſcribed to *Prudentius*, whereas it was only the objectiō of *Symmachus*, and anſwered by *Prudentius*, who wrote againſt *Symmachus*, as alſo did *Amb.*

Fathers? and commit you whoredome after their abominations? So the Prophet *Zachary* cries, *Be ye not as your Fathers, Zach.* 1. 4. The like may be ſeen in other places. His Majeſty likewiſe alledgeth our Saviour telling us, that we muſt not ſo much hearken to what was ſaid by them of old time, as to that which he ſhall tell us, *Mat.* 5. 21. &c. (not as it is cited, 21. 12.) *pag.* 48. It is ſtrange therefore that the Marqueſſe ſhould ſay, that all the markes of the true Church were waved by His Majeſty. As for the markes ſet down by the Marqueſſe, our learned writers have over and over ſhewed the inſufficiency of them, ſo that there is no need now to ſay much. Firſt for Univerſality, it is certaine that error may ſpread for a while more univerſally then truth. So did *Gentiliſme* for many ages, it overſpread in a manner the whole World. Onely in *Judah* was God known, *Pſal.* 76. 1. Onely the people of the *Jewes* had Gods ſaving truth among them, all the World beſides did lie in groſſe ignorance, and damnable error, *Pſal.* 147. 19. 20. *Joh.* 4. 22. *Rom.* 3. 1, 2. 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 5. *Eph.* 2. 11, 12. *Acts* 14. 16. & 17. 30. So for a while Arrianiſme did beare all the ſway, in ſo much that as *Hierome* obſerved, *The World groaned, and wondered to ſee it ſelfe become an Arrian.* So alſo did Pelagianiſme, as *Bradwardine* ſometimes Archbiſhop of *Canterbury* complained. *As in times paſt* (ſaith he) *againſt one true Prophet there were* 850 *Prophets of* Baal, *and the like, to whom an innumerable company of people did adhere: So alſo now in this cauſe, how many, O Lord, doe with* Pelagius *fight for Free will againſt Thy Free grace? The whole World almoſt is gone into error after Pelagius.* And againe, *The whole World almoſt goeth after him, and favoureth his errors, whiles all almoſt thinke that by the ſtrength of Free-Will alone, they can eſchew evill, and doe good.* The Scripture alſo hath foretold us that *all the World ſhould wonder after the beaſt. Revel.* 13. 3. And that the whore of *Babylon* (whereby that *Rome* is meant, the Scripture is ſo cleare, that even the *Romaniſts* themſelves are forced to confeſſe it) *ſhould*

Hâc defenſio communis furoris eſt furentium multitudo, *Minutius Felix.*

Ingemuit orbis, & Arrianum ſe eſſe miratus eſt. *Hierom. adverſ. Luciferian.*

Sicut olim contra unicum Dei Prophetam 850. Prophetæ *Baal*, & ſimiles ſunt reperti, quibus & innumerabilis populus adhærebat: ita & hodiè in hâc cauſâ quot, Domine, cum *Pelagio* pro libero arbitrio contra gratuitam gratiam tuam pugnant? *Bradward: de cauſâ Dei in Præfat.*

Totus penè mundus poſt hunc abit, & erroribus ejus favet, dum ferè omnes communiter æſtimant ſolius liberi arbitrii viribus ſe poſſe declinare à malo, facere bonum, &c. *Bradw. de cauſ. Dei* lib 2. cap. 31.

ſhould ſit upon many waters, Revel. 17. 1. and that by thoſe waters are meant *Peoples, and Multitudes, and Nations, and Tongues, v.*15. This note therefore, *viz.* Univerſality, is farre from proving the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church. As for the Scriptures which the Marqueſſe citeth, *viz. Eſay* 2. 2. *Pſal.* 2. 8. (not as it is miſ-printed 2.) and *Mat.*14. (not 20) 14. theſe and the like places only ſhew that in the time of the Goſpell the Church ſhould not (as before it was) be confined to one Nation, but ſhould be extended unto all, ſo that Gentiles as well as Jewes, as well one Nation as another ſhould have admittance into it, *the middle wall of partition being now broken down*, Epheſ. 2. 14. So that *there is neither Greeke nor Jew, circumciſion nor uncircumciſion, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free, but Chriſt is all, and in all.* Col. 3. 11.

Bellar. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 2. cap. 2. *Ril.* in Apoc. 14. & 17.

2. For Antiquity, it is true, the Prophet *Jeremy* bids, *Aske for the old paths, where is the good way, and walke therein. Ier.* 6. 16. And ſo we grant that primary antiquity is a ſure note of truth, for error being a deviation and ſwerving from truth, it muſt needs be that truth is more ancient then error. But there is a ſecondary antiquity which is no argument of truth. For there is *vetuſtas erroris*, as *Cyprian* obſerved long agoe, *an antiquity of error.* The woman of *Samaria* could ſay, *Our Fathers worſhipped in this Mountaine*; yet our Saviour anſwered her, *Yee worſhip yee know not what. Joh.* 4. 20. 22. And *Symmachus* (whom His Majeſty cited) could bring in heatheniſh *Rome* thus pleading antiquity, *Let me uſe thoſe ceremonies, which mine anceſtors have uſed. It's too late, and too great an injury to reforme me now I am old.* This plea, I dare ſay our adverſaries themſelves will not allow as uſed by *Symmachus*; and why then ſhould we allow it, as they uſe it?

Id verum quodcunque primum; id adulterum quodcunque poſterius. *Tert. adverſ. Prax* c. 4

Cypr. Epiſt. 74. Edit. Pamel.

Utar ceremoniis avitis, ſera & contumelioſa eſt emendatio ſenectutis. *Sym.*

Thirdly, for Viſibility, it is granted that ordinarily the Church is viſible, *i.e.* that there is a viſible company of ſuch as profeſſe the truth, though the places cited by the Marqueſſe doe not evince ſo much. He ſaith, *David* compares the Church to *a Tabernacle in the Sun.* He meanes *Pſal.* 19. 4. where indeed according to the vulgar Latine tranſlation it is, *He hath ſet his Tabernacle in the Sun*: but * *Genebrard* is forced to expound it by an Hypallage

* In ſole poſuit Tabernaculum ſuum. Solem poſuit in Tabernaculo ſuo, *i.e.* in cœlis: unde Hebr. Soli poſuit tentorium in eis *Genebr.*

thus,

thus, *He hath ſet the Sun in his Tabernacle*, that is, *in the heavens.* For (as he confeſſeth) the Hebrew runs thus, *He hath ſet a Tabernacle for the Sun in them.* Now what is this to the Viſibility of the Church? or how doth it concerne the Church at all? Neither do I ſee, that (as the Marqueſſe alledgeth) our Saviour compares the Church to a candle in a candleſtick, not under a buſhell, *Mat.*5. 15. But either (as *Ianſenius* a Romiſh Writer doth expound it) our Saviour there ſpake of his Apoſtles, who as a candle in a candleſtick were to give light unto the dark world by the preaching of the Goſpel. Or elſe in generall he ſhewed the duty of all, *viz.* That in their places and callings they ought to be a means to inlighten others, eſpecially by their good example. This ſenſe is agreeable to that which follows immediately *ver.* 16. *Let your light ſo ſhine forth before men*, &c. So when our Saviour ſaith *Mat.* 24. 26. *If they ſhall ſay unto you, Behold, he is in the deſert, go not forth: Behold, he is in the ſecret chambers, beleeve it not.* It is nothing to the Churches viſibility, but onely he foreſhews that many ſhould come in his name, pretending themſelves to be Chriſt, and forewarnes to beware of them. Theſe places alledged by the Marqueſſe, are but little to the purpoſe, though (as I ſaid) it is granted, that ordinarily the Church (*i. e.* the company of ſuch as profeſſe the truth) is viſible. Yet nevertheleſſe we hold that ſometimes through perſecution, and prevalencie of error, the Church may be ſo obſcured, as to be ſcarcely viſible. Thus it was in *Elias* his time, when he complained unto God, ſaying, *The children of* Iſrael *have forſaken thy Covenant, throwne downe thine Altars, and ſlaine thy Prophets with the ſword, and I, even I am* * *left, and they ſeeke my life to take it away.* 1 King. 19. 10. And what great viſibility was there of the Church, when both Prieſts, and People, were conſpired together againſt Chriſt, to put him to death, and his Diſciples alſo generally forſook him, and fled from him. So when the hereſie of *Arrius* overſpread all, ſo that ſuch as were orthodox and ſound in the faith, could ſcarce appear; † *Hilarius*, who lived in thoſe times, ſaith, that mountains, and woods, and lakes, and Priſons, and deep pits, were more ſafe then Churches, and publick places of Gods worſhip, theſe being all poſſeſſed by the *Arrians*, and the true beleeving Chriſtians having onely the other to lurke and lie hid in. How viſible alſo

* I am left alone, Rom. 11. 3

† *Hilar. contra Auxent*: Montes mihi, & ſilvæ, & lacus, & carceres, & voragines, ſunt tutiores, &c.

was

was the Church like to be, when that ſhould be fulfilled which is written *Revel.* 13. 15, 16, 17. that *as many as would not worſhip the Beaſt, ſhould be killed. And that all both great and ſmall ſhould be forced to receive a marke in their right hand, or in their foreheads. And that none ſhould buy, or ſell, ſave he that had the marke, or the name of the Beaſt, or the number of his name.* Bellarmine himſelfe ſaith, *It is certaine that the perſecution by Antichriſt ſhall be moſt grievous, and moſt notorious, ſo that all publick ceremonies of Religion and Sacrifices ſhall ceaſe.* * And againe, *that in the time of Antichriſt the publike ſervice of the Church ſhall ceaſe through the grievouſneſſe of perſecution, and that Antichriſt ſhall interdict all divine worſhip, &c.*

Certũ eſt Antichriſti perſecutionem fore graviſſimam, & notiſſimam, ita ut ceſſent omnes publicæ religionis ceremoniæ, & ſacrificia. *Bell. de Pont. Rom. l. 3. c. 7.* * Denique quòd Antichriſti tempore propter atrocitatem perſecutionis ceſſare debeat publicum, & quotidianum Eccleſiæ officium, &c. Antichriſtum interdicturum omnem divinum cultum. *Ibid.*

4. For Succeſſion of Paſtours, which the Marqueſſe ſaith is required in a true Church, and is onely to be found in the Church of *Rome*. We muſt diſtinguiſh of Succeſſion: There is a ſucceſſion of Perſons, and a ſucceſſion of Doctrine; the former ſucceſſion without the latter is to no purpoſe. The Prieſts that condemned Chriſt had a perſonal ſucceſſion, but that was worth nothing, they wanting doctrinall ſucceſſion. They did perſonally ſucceed thoſe that were before them, and they others, and ſo on till they came to *Aaron:* but they could not ſhew the like ſucceſſion of their doctrine. So neither can they of the Church of *Rome* ſhew that they hold the ſame faith which was delivered by the Apoſtles; and therefore though they can ſhew that their Popes doe perſonally ſucceed one another from the very times of the Apoſtles, it availes nothing. * *Bellarmine*, though he ſtruggle a little about it, yet cannot deny but that a ſucceſſion of perſons is to be found is the Greek Church, and therefore grants that it doth not neceſſarily follow, that where ſuch ſucceſſion is, there is alſo a true Church. Yea, he ſaith, that all thoſe Patriarchall Churches had for a long time Biſhops, that were manifeſt Heretiques, and that therefore the ſucceſſion of ancient Paſtours was interrupted. What is this elſe but to confeſſe that a ſucceſſion of Paſtours

* *Bell. de Eccleſ. l.* 4. *c.* 8. Non colligitur neceſſariò, ibi eſſe Eccleſiam, ubi eſt ſucceſſio. Omnes Eccleſiæ illæ Patriarchales habuerunt per longa tempora Epiſcopos manifeſtos hæreticos, & proinde interrupta eſt veterum Paſtorum ſucceſſio.

ſtours without a ſucceſſion of the true doctrine is no mark of a true Church. The ancient Doctors of the Church, tis true, have ſometimes uſed this argument drawne from ſucceſſion, to convince Heretiques, but ſo as to ſhew that a ſucceſſion of doctrine did concur with a ſucceſſion of perſons. Yea they plainly ſhew, that it was ſucceſſion of doctrine, which they did ſtand upon, and that without this they made no account of the other. (a) *We muſt adhere unto thoſe* (ſaith *Ireneus*) *who keep the doctrine of the Apoſtles*. This ſucceſſion of doctrine he calls *the principall ſucceſſion*. So (b) *Ambroſe*, *They doe not ſucceed* Peter, *who have not the faith of* Peter. And (c) *Tertullian* ſpeaking of Heretiques, ſaith, *Their doctrine being compared with the Apoſtles doctrine, ſhewes that it was not received from the Apoſtles, nor from any Apoſtolicall teachers*. And ſpeaking of Churches planted ſince the Apoſtles times, he ſaith, That (d) *they agreeing in the ſame faith, are nevertheleſſe accounted Apoſtolicall for the conſanguinity of doctrine*.

(a) Oportet adhærere his, qui Apoſtolorum doctrinam cuſtodiunt. *Iren. l.4.c.44.* And *c. 43. he calls this* Principalem ſucceſſionem.

(b) Non habent Petri hæreditatem, qui fidem Petri non habent. *Amb. de pœn. l.1.c.6.*

(c) Ipſa doctrina eorum cum Apoſtolica comparata, ex diverſitate & contrarietate ſua pronuntiabit, neq; Apoſtoli alicujus authoris eſſe, neq; Apoſtoli. *Tertul de præſcrip. c.32.*

(d) In eadem fide conſpirantes, non minùs Apoſtolicæ deputantur pro conſanguinitate doctrinæ. *Ibid.*

5. For Unity in doctrine; by which the Marqueſſe proves the Roman Church to be the true Church: I anſwer, that Unity without Verity will not prove it, and the one is not alwayes neceſſarily accompanyed with the other. *The words of the Prophets declare good unto the King with one mouth*, ſaid the meſſenger to *Micaiah*, 1 *King.*22.13. They were about foure hundred Prophets, *ver.6.* and all of them did agree in one; yet they prophecyed falſly for all that, there was a lying ſpirit in the mouth of all thoſe Prophets, how unanimous ſoever they were, *ver.* 22. Neither is there ſuch unity in the Church of *Rome* as is pretended. The difference betwixt the Dominicans and the Jeſuits about Gods decrees, the concurrence of his grace, and the determination of mans will; this difference (I ſay) betwixt them is as great, and as important as any (I think) that is amongſt Proteſtants. Neither doth it ſuffice to ſay (as the Marqueſſe doth) that the Church hath not determined any thing in theſe points, and therefore ſuch difference about them is not againſt the Churches unity.

For

For if the Popes authority be ſo great, and his judgement ſo infallible, as they pretend, why hath he not decided the controverſie, and ſo put an end to the difference long ere this? Beſides (which the Marqueſſe took no notice of) they of the *Romane* Church differ much about the very head of it, the Pope himſelfe. For ſome will have him to be above a generall councell & others hold the councell to be above the Pope: and this alſo was the determination both of the councell of *Conſtance*, and of the councell of *Baſill*. Finally, I grant, that unity in the truth is much to be deſired, and ſo much the places cited by the Marqueſſe doe prove, *viz.* 1 *Cor.* 1.10. *Eph.*4.3. *Acts* 2.42. *Phil.*1. 27. & 2. 2. yet we ſee that the Apoſtle doth acknowledge the Church of *Corinth* a true Church notwithſtanding the differences and diviſions that were in it, ſo that all diſ-union of people is not enough to diſ-church them. Neither if the confeſſions of the reformed Churches be conſidered, as they ought to be, wil the differences that are among them (however particular perſons be exorbitant) be found ſo many, and ſo great (though too many, and too great; I grant) as our adverſaries of *Rome* would make them.

6. And laſtly, for the converſion of Nations, which the Marqueſſe alſo will have to be a marke of the true Church, and thereby prove that the Church of *Rome* is it, and not the Church of Proteſtants; I anſwer, that the Scriptures which hee alledgeth, *viz.* *Eſay* 49. 23. and 60. 16. and *Pſal.*2. 8. doe ſhew indeed, that in the time of the Goſpell the *Gentiles* ſhould be converted, and joyned to the Church, which the Scripture of the New Teſtament, and experience alſo ſhewes to have been accompliſhed. But they doe not ſhew either that every true Church muſt neceſſarily evidence it ſelfe to be a true Church by working a converſion in infidels, or that every Church that doth worke any converſion in that kind, muſt therefore be acknowledged to be a true Church. The Scribes and Phariſees did make Proſelytes, and were very zealous in it, yet nevertheleſſe were guilty of groſſe errors, which all were to beware of as moſt pernicious, *Mat.*23.15. Beſides, there is a converſion as from unbeliefe to faith, ſo from misbeliefe to a right and ſound faith. And though Proteſtants have done little or nothing it may be in the former kinde of converſion, ſo as to convert meer

Infidels, yet in the other kinde, *viz.* in converting miſ-believers, they have done much. This the Marqu ſſe (*pag.* 44.) is pleaſed to call *perverſion* rather then *converſion*; but that muſt be judged by the conſideration of the Doctrines held by Proteſtants. As for thoſe converſions wrought in the Indies by the Romaniſts, we may well conceive that it was not ſo much the word preached by the Jeſuits, as the ſword brandiſhed by the *Spaniards*, that did worke them. † *Franciſcus de Victoria* (a learned Writer among the Papiſts) writing of the Indians, ſaith he did not ſee, that the Chriſtian faith was ſo propounded and declared to them, as that under the guilt of a new ſin they were bound to embrace it. He heard (he ſayes) of no Miracles, and Signes that were wrought, nor of very good examples of life that were given, but on the contrary of many ſcandalous acts, and many impieties. Whereupon he conceiveth, that Chriſtian religion was not ſo conveniently and properly preached to that barbarous people, as that they were bound to acquieſce in it, though he grants, that there were many religious, and other Eccleſiaſticall men, who both by life and example, and alſo by diligent preaching did ſufficiently doe their indeavour, but that they were hindred by others, who minded other matters. Thus I have as briefly as I could gone over the markes, which the Marqueſſe aſſigneth of the true Church, and that becauſe he ſaith that his Majeſty did wave them all, whereas indeed his Majeſty did not wholly wave them, though as his occaſions would not ſuffer him to return any anſwer at all to the Marqueſſes reply, ſo neither would they (it's likely) permit him to anſwer the former Paper ſo fully as otherwiſe he would have done. Whereas the Marqueſſe ſaith, that His Majeſty is pleaſed to make recourſe unto the Scriptures, This is ſurely the courſe that all ought to follow, that wil diſcuſſe matters of Religion, they ought to have recourſe to the Scriptures, by wch all ſuch matters are to be tried and determined. *To the Law, and to the*

† Non ſatis liquet mihi an fides Chriſtiana fuerit barbaris hactenus ita propoſita, & annuntiata, ut teneantur credere ſub novo peccato. ---Miracula & ſigna nulla audio, nec exempla vitæ adeò religioſa: contrà multa ſcandala, ſeu facinora, & multas impietates; unde non videtur, quòd religio Chriſtiana ſatis commodè & piè ſit illis prædicata, ut illi teneantur acquieſcere; quanquam videntur multi religioſi, & alii Eccleſiaſtici viri, & vitâ, & exemplo, & diligenti prædicatione ſufficienter operam & induſtriam adhibuiſſe in hoc negotio, niſi ab aliis, quibus alia cura eſt, impediti eſſent. *Franciſc de Victor. Relect.* 4. Sect. 38.

the teſtimony (ſaith the Prophet *Eſay*) *if they ſpeake not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them.* *Eſay* 8. 20.

* *Auguſtine* ſpeaking of the *Donatiſts*, bade let them ſhew their Church onely by the Canonicall bookes of the Scriptures, profeſſing that he would not have any to beleeve that he was in the true Church, becauſe of the commendation that *Optatus*, *Ambroſe*, and many others did give of it. And againe, *Let us not heare* (ſaith he) *Thus ſay I, thus ſayeſt thou, but let us heare, Thus ſaith the Lord.--- Let thoſe things be removed out of the way, which we alledge one againſt another, otherwiſe then from the Bookes of Canonicall Scripture.--- I will not have the holy Church demonſtrated by humane tokens, but by divine Oracles.* But ſaith the Marqueſſe.

* Utrùm ipſi Eccleſiam teneant, non niſi divinarum Scripturarum Canonicis libris oſtendant: quia nec nos propterea dicimus nobis credi oportere, quòd in Eccleſiâ Chriſti ſumus, quia ipſam quam tenemus, commendavit Mileviranus Optatus, vel Mediolanenſis *Ambroſius*, vel alii innumerabiles noſtræ communionis Epiſcopi. *Aug. de unit. Eccleſ. cap.* 16. Non audiamus, Hæc dico, hæc dicis, ſed audiamus, Hæc dicit Dominus.--Auferantur illa de medio, quæ adverſus nos invicem non ex divinis Canonicis libris, ſed aliundè recitamus.——Nolo humanis documentis, ſed divinis oraculis ſanctam Eccleſiam demonſtrari. *Aug. ibid. cap.* 3.

What Heretick that ever was, did not do ſo? How ſhall the greateſt Heretick in the World be confuted or cenſured, if any man may be permitted to appeale to Scriptures, margin'd with his own notes, ſens'd with his owne meaning, and enlivened with his owne private ſpirit? to what end were thoſe markes ſo fully, both by the Prophets, the Apoſtles, and our Saviour himſelfe ſet down, if we make no uſe of them? Page 52.

Anſw. 1. Though Hereticks make recourſe unto Scripture, it follows not that therefore this is not the courſe which ought to be followed, or that therefore they are Hereticks that doe it. The Marqueſſe himſelfe did make recourſe unto Scripture in ſetting down the markes of the true Church, and ſo alſo doth he in handling ſundry points in controverſie betwixt Papiſts, and Proteſtants. This courſe therefore, himſelfe being Judge, is not to be condemned: neither certainly is it, however Hereticks may abuſe it. Though Hereticks will alledge Scripture in defence of their Hereſies, yet are they nevertheleſſe to be confuted by Scripture. The *Sadduces* thought by Scripture to overthrow the reſurrection, yet by Scripture did our Saviour convince them. *Mat.* 22. 23. 32. Yea when the Devill himſelfe did cite Scripture,

our Saviour did not therefore diſlike it, but made uſe of it for the reſiſting of Satan, and the repelling of his temptation, *Mat.*4.6,7.

2. It's true, none may appeal to Scriptures margin'd with their own Notes, ſens'd with their own meaning, and enliven'd with their own private ſpirit. It's to no purpoſe to alledge Scripture, except that ſenſe, in which it is alledged, may be made good by Scripture. The Jewiſh Rabbin (as Maſter *Selden* cites him) ſaith well, *All interpretation (of Scripture) Which is not grounded upon the Scripture, is vaine.* But what this makes againſt his Majeſties making recourſe unto the Scriptures, or againſt any mans taking that courſe in diſputes of this nature, I doe not ſee. For that his Majeſty did ſo make recourſe unto Scripture, the Marqueſſe doth not ſay, neither ought any man to be charged in this kind, except it can be proved that he is indeed guilty.

כל העתקה שאין לה ס'וע מן הכתוב היא בטלה

Eliah Ben Moſis apud Selden: de Anno Civili Hebræorum, cap.2.

3. It doth not yet appear that the particulars before mentioned, *viz.* Univerſality, Antiquity, Viſibility, Succeſſion of Paſtours, Unity in Doctrine, and Converſion of Nations; that theſe (I ſay) were ſet down either by our Saviour, or his Apoſtles, or the Prophets, as marks of the True Church, at leaſt ſo as to make any thing for the Marqueſſes purpoſe, *viz.* to prove the Church of *Rome* to be the True Church.

Marq: pag. 54. *Your Majeſty was pleaſed to urge the Errours of certain Fathers, to the prejudice of their Authority. Which I conceive would have been ſo, had they been all Montaniſts, Rebaptiſts, all Anthropomorphiſts, and all of them generally guilty of the faults, Wherewith they were ſeverally charged in the particulars: ſeeing that when we produce a Father, We doe not intend to produce a man in whoſe mouth was never found guile; the infallibility being never attributed by us otherwiſe then unto the Church, not unto particular Church men. As your Majeſty hath moſt excellently obſerved in the failings of the holy Apoſtles, who erred after they had received the Holy Ghoſt in ſo ample manner. But when they were all gathered together in Councell, and could ſend about their Edicts with theſe Capitall Letters in the Front,* Viſum eſt Sipritui Sancto, & nobis, *Act.*15.28. *then I hope your Majeſty cannot ſay, that it was poſſible for them to Erre. So though the Fathers might erre in particulars; yet thoſe particular Errours would be ſwallowed up in a Generall Councell, &c.*

Anſw. Here the Marqueſſe grants, that the Fathers ſingly and ſeverally

rally conſidered, may erre, but not if gathered together in a generall Councell. But firſt, doth not this invalidate the authority of the Fathers, when they are ſeverally cited, as they are in this Reply frequently by the Marqueſſe? Indeed, here preſently after he addes, *Neither is a particular defection in any man any exception againſt his teſtimony, except it be in the thing wherein he is deficient.* But certainly if a man be liable to errour in one thing, he is ſo in another thing; and therefore his bare teſtimony, except it have ſomething to ſupport it, is not ſufficient to rely upon. *The teſtimony of the Lord is ſure,* ſaith *David, Pſal.* 19. 7. becauſe he can neither deceive, nor be deceived. But man may, and therefore his teſtimony, as his, is not ſure. No, *Let God be true, and every man a lyar,* ſaith the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 3. 4.

2. For a generall Councell, why it ſhould neceſſarily be exempt from Errour, I ſee nothing here alledged by the Marqueſſe, except it be, that *Acts* 15. 28. *It ſeemed good to the holy Ghoſt, and to us.* But the inference made from that Councell, wherein the Apoſtles themſelves did ſit, and give ſentence, to prove that no generall Councell can Erre, is no better than if one ſhould argue, that a particular Father or Doctor is infallible, becauſe a particular Apoſtle was ſo in that which he either wrote or preached. For we muſt take heed of entertaining ſuch a thought (although the Marqueſſes words do ſeem to imply ſo much) as that each particular Apoſtle might fall into Errour, though all of them together could not. For how then ſhould we be able to build our faith upon thoſe Scriptures, which were compoſed by particular Apoſtles, and not by a whole Councell of them? It's true, (as his Majeſty obſerved, pag. 50.) the Apoſtles were ignorant, and erronious in ſome things, but not in any thing that they delivered unto People to believe, and obey, either by word, or writing; for then (as I ſaid) we could have no certainty of the Scriptures, we could not be built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, as Believers are, *Epheſ.* 2. 20. But that generall Councells may erre, *Auſtin* made no queſtion; * *Who knowes not* (ſaith he) *that Provinciall and Nationall Councells*

* Quis neſciat ipſa concilia, quæ per ſingulas regiones, vel provincias fiunt, plenariorum conciliorum authoritati, quæ fiunt ex univerſo orbe Chriſtiano, ſine ullis ambagibus cedere: ipſaq; plenaria ſæpè priora poſterioribus emendari, cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clauſum erat. *Aug. de baptiſ. contra Donatiſt. lib.* 5. *cap.* 3.

doe yeild to the authority of Generall Councells; and that Generall Councells are often amended, the former by the latter, that being after found out, which before lay hid? It is well known that the Romaniſts reject the authority of the Councels of *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, (two Generall Councels) when they determine the Pope to be inferiour, and ſubject to a Generall Councell. Indeed, generally the *Pontificians* make little account of a Councel, though otherwiſe never ſo generall, except it be confirmed by the Pope.

Bellarm. de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11.

Bellarmine makes it a clear caſe, and without all difficulty, that Generall Councells may Erre, if the Fathers of the Councell define any thing, when as the Legates of the Pope diſſent from them: or if the Legates themſelves do conſent, but ſo as to go againſt the inſtructions which the Pope gave them. And he further holds, that in caſe the Legates had no certain inſtructions from the Pope, the Councell may Erre, and that before the Popes Confirmation of it, the judgment of a Generall Councell is not infallible. The Marqueſſe himſelf (*pag.* 55. *&c.*) doth ſeeme to aſſent unto His Majeſty, taxing Generall Councells for committing Errours, but ſome paſſages he hath, which to me ſeeme very ſtrange. *If* (ſaith he) *we ſhould ſuppoſe them to be Generall, and free Councels, yet they could not be Erronious in any particular mans judgement, untill a like Generall Councell ſhould have concluded the former to be Erronious.* By this Aſſertion Arrianiſme being confirmed by the Councell of *Ariminum*, *Athanaſius*, and every particular man ſhould have aſſented to it, untill another Generall Councell had determined againſt it; but this is ſuch a poſition, as (I dare ſay) our Romiſh adverſaries themſelves will not allow. Again, *If it ſhould be granted* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *that the Church had at any time determined amiſſe, the Church cannot be ſaid to have erred, becauſe you muſt not take the particular time for the Catholike Church, becauſe the Church is as well Catholike for time, as territory; except you will make rectification an errour.* But when our adverſaries of *Rome* ſpeak of the Churches freedome from errour, they underſtand it of the Church repreſentative, a generall Councel. **It is one and the ſame thing*, (ſaith *Bellarmine*)

Ego exiſtimo tale concilium poſſe errare, neque eſſe infallibile ejus judicium ante confirmationem Pontificis. *Bellarm. ibid.*

Pag. 56.

* Idem eſt eccleſiam non poſſe errare in definiendis rebus fidei, & Epiſcopos non poſſe errare; atqui ſinguli ſeorſim errare poſſunt: igitur congregati in unum errare non poterunt. *Bellarm. de concil. l. 2. c. 2.*

that

that the Church cannot erre in determining matters of faith, and that Biſhops cannot erre. But ſeverally they may erre, therefore being gathered together they ſhall be free from errour. So then, if a Generall Councell may erre at any one time, it is ſufficient to overthrow their Tenet, that the Church cannot erre. That the Church (repreſented in a Generall Councell) may after rectifie what before was amiſſe, and that alſo by the determination of a Generall Councell, is ſo farre from proving, that the Church (as they take it) cannot Erre, that on the contrary it proves, that it may Erre. For though rectification be not errour, yet it doth preſuppoſe Errour. Again, *If I recall mine own words* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *it is no Errour, but an avoidance of Errour. So where the ſame power Rectifies it ſelf, though ſome things formerly have been Decreed amiſſe, yet that cannot render the Decrees of Generall Councels not binding, or incident to Errour,* quoad nos, *though in themſelves,* & pro tempore, *they may be ſo.* I anſwer, it is without all doubt, that for one to recall his words, being Erronious, is no Errour, but a correcting of Errour, yet this doth clearly ſhew a man to be ſubject to Errour. And ſo if the Church at one time in a Generall Councell may Rectifie what at another time in a Generall Councell it had Decreed amiſſe, it evidently appears, that the Church in a Generall Councell may Erre. For otherwiſe, what need of Rectification were there, if there had been no Errour? And certainly, if the Decrees of Generall Councells be Erronious (as the Marqueſſe denies not but they may be) they are not binding *Quoad nos*, we are not bound to aſſent unto them, but rather to diſſent from them: For we are not bound to embrace Errour, but to embrace Truth. *Prove all things, hold faſt that which is good,* ſaith the Apoſtle, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 21. By the Marqueſſes reaſon the Decree of the Councell of *Ariminum*, confirming the Hereſie of *Arrius*, ſhould for the time have been binding; ſo that neither *Athanaſius*, nor any other, ſhould have preſumed to oppoſe it, or to diſſent from it, untill another Generall Councell had declared againſt it.

Pag. 56.

As to your Majeſties objecting the Errours of the Holy Apoſtles, and Pen-men of the Holy Ghoſt, and your inference thereupon, viz. *that Truth is no where to be found but in holy Scripture: under your Majeſties correction I take this to be the greateſt argument againſt the private*

Marq: pag. 56.

private Spirit (urged by your Majesty) its leading us into all Truth, that could possibly be found out. For if such men (as they) indued with the Holy Ghost, innobled with the power of working Miracles, so sanctified in their callings, and inlightned in their understandings, could Erre: how can any man (lesse qualified) assume to himselfe a freedome from Erring, by the assistance of a private Spirit?

Answ. 1. His Majesty was farre from thinking, that the Apostles, as Pen-men of the Holy Ghost, could Erre. For then there were no room for that inference, *That Truth is no where to be found but in Holy Scripture.* 2. His Majesty spake not of any private Spirit, but of the Spirit of God leading us into all Truth, alledging that of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 2.12. *We have received not the spirit of the World, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given unto us of God.* It's true, if any under pretence of the Spirit goe contrary to the Word, (as too many doe) whether they be particular Persons, or generall Councells that doe so, it is a private Spirit, *viz.* their owne Spirit that they are guided by. Therefore Saint *John* bids, *Believe not every spirit, but trie the spirits, whether they be of God, because many false Prophets,* (many that falsly pretend the Spirit) *are gone out into the world,* 1 *John* 4.1. But whoever they be that goe according to the Word, though they be particular and private persons, yet it is not their own particular and private Spirit, but the Spirit of God that doth guide them. *The Scripture was given by inspiration of God,* 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. Therefore it is Gods Spirit, and not Mans, that doth speak in, and by the Scriptures.

Marq. pag. 57. *Lastly, as to your Majesties quotation of so many Fathers, for the Scriptures easinesse, and plainnesse to be understand, If the Scriptures themselves doe tell us, that they are hard to be understood, &c.*

Answ. 1. His Majesty did not quote many Fathers, nor any at all to prove that the Scriptures are every where plain, and easie to be understood, but to shew *that the Scriptures are their own interpreters,* which are His Majesties words, *pag.* 50. To prove this, (which is a most certain truth) His Majesty quoted indeed many Fathers, as *Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Crysostome, Basil, Austine, Gregory* and *Optatus.* The Scriptures quoted by the Marquesse make nothing against this, *viz.* 2 *Pet.* 3.16. *Act.* 8.31. (not, as it is mis-printed, 13.) *Luke* 24.25. (rather 45.) *Apoc.* 5.4.

where

where, not the Angel, (as the Marqueſſe ſaith) but *John* wept, becauſe none was found worthy to open, and to read the Book. Neither doth it appear, that by the Book there mentioned, is meant the Scripture, as the Marqueſſe ſeemeth to ſuppoſe. And ſo indeed many have thought, as the Jeſuit *Ribera* telleth us, who yet nevertheleſſe profeſſeth that he did not ſee how hiſtorically this could be. For this Book was ſhut and ſealed (as he obſerves) untill that time that *John* had this Revelation, when as all the other Apoſtles were deceived: ſo that the Scripture (if it were the Book there ſpoken of) was alwayes ſhut to *Peter* and *Paul*, and the other Apoſtles. The other places (I grant) do ſhew that in the Scriptures there are ſome things obſcure and difficult, at leaſt to ſome; but this is nothing againſt the Scriptures being their own interpreters. What is obſcure in one place, muſt be cleared by ſome other place, or elſe without extraordinary revelation I ſee not how we ſhould attain to the underſtanding of it. No need therefore to put thoſe ſayings of the Fathers, cited by His Majeſty, among the Errata's that are behind their Books, as the Marqueſſe ſpeaketh, *pag.*57. where he addes, *Or elſe We muſt look out ſome other meaning of their words than What your Maj: hath inferred from thence; as thus, they were eaſie in* aliquibus locis, *but not in* omnibus locis: *or thus, they were eaſie as to the attainment of particular ſalvation, but not as to the generall cognizance of all the Divine Myſtery therein contained, &c.* But this is nothing contrary to his Majeſties inference, which was only this, *That the Scriptures are their own Interpreters, i. e.* that Scripture is to be interpreted by Scripture, not that the Scriptures are clear in all points, and in all places; it ſufficeth that (which the Marqueſſe himſelfe doth ſeeme to yeild) they are clear in thoſe things which concern Salvation: And this was *Auſtines* determination, *In thoſe things* (ſaith he) *Which are plainly ſet down in the Scriptures, are found all thoſe things, which concern faith, and good life.* Yea, ſo much the Scripture doth teſtimony of it ſelf, *The teſtimony of the Lord is ſure, making wiſe the ſimple,* Pſal.19.7. *The entrance of thy words giveth light, it giveth underſtanding to the ſimple,* Pſal. 119. 130. *From a child thou haſt known the Scriptures, which are able to make thee wiſe unto ſalvation, &c.* 2 Tim.3.15.

At ego non video, quo modo hiſtoricè liber, de quo loquitur Joannes, ſit S. Scriptura. *Ribera in Apoc. 5. 1.*

In iis, que apertè poſita ſunt in Scripturâ, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreſq; vivendi. *Aug. de doct. Chriſt. lib. 2. cap. 9.*

Marq: p. 57, 58. *First, We hold the reall preſence, you deny it; We ſay his Body is there, you ſay there is nothing but bare Bread: We have Scripture for it,* Mat. 20. *(for* 26.*)* 26. Take eat, this is my Body. *So* Luke 22. 19. This is my Body which is given for you.

Anſw. Here the Marqueſſe comes to performe that which before he promiſed *(pag.* 53, *&* 54.*) viz.* to ſhew that in thoſe points wherein they and we differ, the Scriptures are on their ſide, and not on ours: And he begins with the controverſie about the preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, alledging thoſe words, *This is my Body*, as a clear proof of their opinion, *viz.* that after Conſecration there is no longer the ſubſtance of Bread, but that the Bread is tranſubſtantiated, and turned into the ſubſtance of Chriſts Body. But doth it appear that thoſe words, *This is my Body*, are to be underſtood properly any more than thoſe, *Gen.* 17. 10. *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, every man-child among you ſhall be circumciſed?* There Circumciſion is called Gods Covenant, whereas properly it was not the Covenant it ſelf, but the token of the Covenant, as it is called immediately after, *ver.* 11. So *Exod.* 12. 13. and in other places the Lamb is called the Lords Paſſeover, whereas properly it was not the Paſſeover, but a Token of the Paſſeover, being ſlain, and eaten in remembrance of the Lords paſſing over the houſes of the *Iſraelites*, when he ſaw the Firſt-born of the *Ægyptians*, *Exod.* 12. 13. And thus alſo it's ſaid, 1 *Cor.* 10. 4. that *the Rock was Chriſt.* How could that be? Not in reſpect of Subſtance, but in reſpect of Signification; the Rock ſignified Chriſt, was a Type and a Figure of Chriſt. *Bellarmine* (I know) doth indeavour to elude all theſe inſtances, as if the ſpeeches were not Figurative, but Proper. To that place concerning Circumciſion he anſwereth, that both Speeches are proper, *viz. Circumciſion is the Covenant*, and *Circumciſion is the Token of the Covenant.* Circumciſion (he ſaith) was the Token of the Covenant, as the Covenant is taken for Gods Promiſe: and it was alſo the Covenant it ſelf, as the Covenant is taken for the Inſtrument whereby the Promiſe is applyed. But here *Bellarmine* is contrary both to himſelf, and to Reaſon. He is contrary to himſelfe, for a little before he ſaith, that theſe words, *Circumciſion is the Token of the Covenant*, *Gen.* 17. 11. are an Expli-

Bell. de Euchar. l. 1. c. 11. Sect. Secundò vocatum eſt.

Ibid. Sect. Quartò peccat.

cation

cation of that which went before, *ver.* 10. *viz.* that *Circumciſion is the Covenant.* Now if the one be an Explication of the other, then needs muſt the word Covenant be taken alike in both. He is alſo contrary unto Reaſon, for it is abſurd to ſay, that a Covenant doth properly ſignifie both a Promiſe, and alſo an Inſtrument, whereby the Promiſe is applyed. As well may one ſay, that Chriſts Body doth properly ſignifie both his Body, and alſo the Sacrament of his Body. A Covenant, in the very nature of it, being properly taken, doth ſignifie a Promiſe: and therefore the inſtrument, whereby it is applyed, cannot properly be the Covenant, but onely the Token, Pledge, and Aſſurance of it. It may as well be ſaid, that a Covenant may have two diverſe and diſtinct natures, as that a Covenant can be taken two diverſe and diſtinct wayes, and yet be taken properly both the one way, and the other.

To thoſe words, *It* (*viz.* the Lamb) *is the Lords paſſeover*, Exod. 12. 11. *Bellarmine* anſwers, that the Speech is not Figurative, but Proper. The Lamb he ſaith was properly the Lords Paſſeover: and mark his Reaſon, *Quia agnus immolabatur in memoriam illius tranſitus*; that is, *Becauſe the Lamb was ſlain* (or *ſacrificed*) *in memory of that paſſeover*, or paſſing over. Now what greater abſurdity can there be, then this, which here *Bellarmine* doth fall into? He alledgeth that as a Reaſon of his aſſertion, which indeed doth quite overthrow it. For if the Lamb were ſlaine, and ſacrificed in memory of the Lords Paſſeover, or paſſing over, then was it not properly the Paſſeover it ſelf, but only a Signe and Memoriall of it. Bellarm. Ibid. Quædam citantur.

As for thoſe words, 1*Cor.* 10. 4. *The Rock was Chriſt*; *Bellarmine* ſaith, that not a Materiall, but a Spirituall work is there meant; and that therefore, though the word *Rock* be taken Figuratively, yet the propoſition it ſelfe, *The Spirituall Rock was Chriſt*, is not figuratively, but properly taken. But it is evident, that the Rock ſpoken of by the Apoſtle, was a materiall Rock, a Rock of Stone: For the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of a Rock which the *Iſraelites* drank of; *They drank of that Rock*, ſaith he. Now that Rock which the *Iſraelites* drank of, was a materiall Rock, a Rock of Stone, as *Moſes* doth ſhew, *Exod.* 17. and *Numb.* 20. *Auſtin* never queſtioned this to be the meaning of Bellarm. ubi ſupra, Sect. Illud etiam.

Quodammodo omnia ſignificantia videntur earum rerum, quas ſignificant, ſuſtinere perſonas: ſicut dictum eſt ab Apoſtolo, petra erat Chriſtus, quoniam Petra illa, de quâ hoc dictum eſt, ſignificabat utique Chriſtum. *Aug. de civit. Dei lib.* 18. *cap.* 48.

the Apoſtles words, *After a ſort* (ſaith he) *all things ſignifying, ſeeme to be inſtead of thoſe things, which they ſignifie: as it is ſaid by the Apoſtle, The Rocke was Chriſt, becauſe that Rock, of which that is ſpoken, did indeed ſignifie Chriſt.*

Theſe words of that learned Father are very remarkable, ~~that~~ onely for the underſtanding of that particular place of Scripture, but alſo for the determining of the maine Controverſie betwixt us, and our Romane Adverſaries. For he not onely ſaith, that the Rock is ſaid to have been Chriſt, becauſe it did ſignifie Chriſt, ſuppoſing and taking it as granted, that the Apoſtle ſpake of a materiall Rock; but alſo he ſaith, that after a ſort all things ſignifying are inſtead of the things ſignified by them, and therefore are called by the ſame names. If our adverſaries would minde this rule, they would ſoon ſee, that they have no cauſe to inſiſt upon thoſe words, *This is my Body*, and to urge the proper ſenſe of them. But for theſe words, *The Rock was Chriſt*, *Bellarmine* argueth that a materiall Rock is not there meant, becauſe the Apoſtle calleth it *a ſpirituall Rock*. I anſwer, ſo the Apoſtle there calleth Manna ſpirituall meat, yet was Manna a materiall thing, onely it had a ſpirituall ſignification. And ſo alſo was the Rock a materiall Rock, onely it's called ſpirituall for the ſame reaſon. *Bellarmine* objects, that a materiall Rock did not follow the *Iſraelites*, as the Apoſtle ſaith that the Rock did, which hee ſpeakes of; *for they dranke* (ſaith he) *of that ſpirituall Rock that followed them.* I anſwer 1. The materiall Rock may be ſaid to have followed them, that is, to have ſatisfied their deſire of water. Thus (as *Beza* obſerves) * *Photius* a Greek Author doth expound it, and ſo alſo (as *Pareus* teſtifies) *Lyra* and *Dionyſius*, two Romiſh expoſitors. *Bellarmine* notes *Peter Martyr*, as thus expounding it, neither hath he any thing againſt this expoſition, but only that the Greek Fathers, and *Eraſmus* interpret the word uſed by the Apoſtle *comitante*, *i.e.* accompanying. But this is nothing, for they might meane accompanying in a metaphoricall ſenſe,

* σωεπομένης αὐτῶν τῷ βελήματι. *Photius apud Oecumen*: though I confeſſe, he underſtands it of Chriſt as meant by the ſpirituall Rock there mentioned.

ſenſe, *viz.* in reſpect of ſatisfying the deſire. Againe, the Rock may be ſaid to have followed the *Iſraelites*, in that the water flowing forth of the Rock, did follow them. *Genebrard*, a great man of the Romiſh party, commenting upon thoſe words, *Pſal.* 78.15. *He clave the Rocks in the Wilderneſſe, &c.* ſaith that the Septuagint, and the vulgar Latine interpreter have it in the ſingular number, *Rock*, becauſe by the Hebrew traditions there was but one Rock, which was ſmitten, and ſo ſent forth water, at ſeverall times, and in ſeverall places: and that this Rock did remove with the Iſraelites, and follow them in their travells through the Wilderneſſe. And this, he ſaith, is agreable to that of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10. 4. But this is over Rabbinicall, and therfore he addes, that the Rock may be ſaid to have followed the Iſraelites, that is, that the water which flowed out of the Rock did follow them, either in that they themſelves by their own art, and induſtrie did derive and bring it to the place, where they camped; or that it was effected by Gods tranſmiſſion and direction. *Bellarmine* objects, that a little after the Iſraelites did want water againe, as as we read *Num.* 20. and therefore the water did not follow them. But that want of water ſpoken of *Num.* 20. was not a little after, but a long time after the other mentioned *Exod.* 17. For that in *Exodus* was the Iſraelites camped in *Rephidim*, not long after they came out of *Egypt*; and the other was when they camped in *Kadeſh*, in the fourtieth yeare after they left *Egypt*, as is noted in the Hebrew Chronicle called *Seder Olam* cap. 9. Compare *Numbers* 33. 14. with 36.

Niſi malis conſecutam petram, id eſt, petræ fluxum, per derivationem, *viz.* & deductionem aquæ à populo ad loca caſtrorum procuratam, ſive per ipſius Dei tranſmiſſionem & directionem. *Genebr loc. citat*

Paulò poſt indiguerunt rurſus aqua. *Bell. ubi ſupra, Sect. Calvinus.*

* *Genebrard* in the place before cited, meetes with this Objection, that *Bellarmine* makes, and anſwers, that according to the *Rabbins* both ancient, and moderne, that which is recorded *Num.* 20. is meant of the ſame Rock that is ſpoken of *Exod.* 17. the water whereof (they ſay) did faile becauſe of *Miriams* death (which happened there in *Kadeſh*) untill upon the peoples

* Nec obſtat, quòd in deſerto excitatum ſit alterum murmur ob aquæ penuriam, ut ſecundò educeretur aqua ex alterâ rupe poſt annos 38. Nam de hâc ipſâ rupe, nempe de priore hâc Rabbini veteres, & recentiores intelligunt, cujus aquam tradunt defeciſſe propter Mariæ mortem, donec ſecundò educeretur ex eâdem ad ſecundū de aquâ murmur. *Genebr. ubi ſupra.*

murmuring againe it was drawn out of the ſame Rock the ſecond time.

This conceit of the *Rabbines* is far from pleaſing me, onely I note how little force *Bellarmines* objection was of with his own copartner *Genebrard*. Indeed this is enough to ſhew the vanity of the objection, that (as *Genebrard* notes) the want of water in *Kadeſh* was 38. years after that in *Rephidim*, and therefore was not (as *Bellarmine* ſayes) a little after. But though it had not been one halfe quarter of that time before the *Iſraelites* wanted water againe, yet that is no argument why the Apoſtle ſpeaking of the Rock that followed them, ſhould not meane a materiall and viſible Rock; for the materiall and viſible Rock, that is, the water that flowed from it, might follow the *Iſraelites*, though but for while, even ſo long as they encamped in *Rephidim*: neither doth the Apoſtle ſay, that it followed them either perpetually, or for any long time, but onely that it followed them. But howſoever it be underſtood, that the Rock followed them (which I confeſſe is ſomewhat obſcure) how by the Rock there ſhould be meant Chriſt, as the efficient cauſe giving them water to drinke? For to drinke of the Rock, is there expreſſed in the ſame phraſe, as to drinke of the Cup, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Neither (I thinke) can one in any congruity be ſaid to drinke of a man, that giveth him either water, or any thing elſe to drinke; but onely to drinke either of the liquour, or (metonymically) of that wherein the liquour is contained. Finally *Bellarmine* himſelfe doth acknowledge, that the materiall Rock, which afforded the *Iſraelites* water to drinke, was a figure of Chriſt, and that the water proceeding from that Rock, was a figure of Chriſts Blood; onely he denies, that ſo much is meant by the Apoſtle in thoſe words, *they dranke of the ſpirituall Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Chriſt.* But, I demand then, from what place of Scripture, if not from thoſe words of the Apoſtle, can ſo much bee gathered?

ἔπινον ἐκ πέτρας. ἐκ τῆς πολιτείας, πιέτω.

Bell. ubi ſuprà, *Sect.* eſt tamen.

* *Janſenius* a learned Romaniſt, is more candid and free then *Bellarmine*; for expounding the Parable of the ſower he ſaith that the word *is* (as when it is ſaid, *The ſeed is the word of God, &c. Luke* 8. 11.) is put for *ſignifieth*, as alſo there where it is ſaid, *And the Rock was Chriſt.*

* *Eſt* hic ponitur pro ſignificare, quemadmodum & ibi, Petra autem erat Chriſtus. *Janſen. concord. cap.* 51.

And

And ſo alſo (ſay we) when 'tis ſaid, *This is my Body*, the meaning is, *This doth ſignifie my Body*, or, This is a Signe, a Token, a Seal, a Pledge of my Body.

The Lord (ſaith (a) *Auſtine*) *doubted not to ſay, This is my Body, When he gave the Signe of his Body.* And again, ſpeaking of thoſe words, (b) *Except ye eat the fleſh of the ſon of man, and drink his Bloud, ye have no life in you, Joh.* 6.53. he ſaith, That *Chriſt ſeemeth to command ſome hainous act, or ſome groſſe Wickedneſſe: And that therefore it is a figurative ſpeech, requiring us to communicate with the Lords ſufferings, and ſweetly and profitably to keep in memory that his fleſh was Crucified, and wounded for us.* And yet again, (c) *He that is at enmity with Chriſt* (ſaith he) *doth neither eat his Fleſh, nor drink his Bloud, although to the condemnation of his preſumption, he daily receive the Sacrament of ſo great a thing as well as others.*

(a) Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc eſt corpus meus, cum ſignum daret corporis ſui. *Aug. contra Adimant. cap.* 12.

(b) Facinus vel Flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo eſt, præcipiens paſſionibus Domini eſſe communicandum, & ſuaviter atque utiliter recondendum eſſe in memoriâ, quòd pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa, & vulnerata eſt. *Aug. de doct. Chriſt. lib* 3. *cap.* 16.

(c) Qui diſcordat à Chriſto, nec carnem ejus manducat, nec ſanguinem bibit, etiamſi tantæ rei ſacramentum ad judicium ſuæ præſumptionis quotidiè indifferenter accipiat. *Proſper in Sentent. ex Auguſtino, ſent.* 341.

Theſe ſayings of *Auſtin* doe ſufficiently ſhew how he underſtood thoſe words, *This is my Body*, and how far he was from being of the now-Romane Faith concerning the preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament. Indeed, theſe very words, *This is my Body*, which our Adverſaries pretend to make ſo much for them, are moſt ſtrong againſt them, and enough to throw down Tranſubſtantiation. For Chriſt ſaying, *This is my Body*, what is meant by the word *This?* They of the Church of *Rome* cannot agree about it, but ſome ſay one thing, ſome another, only by no means they will have Bread to be meant by it. For they very well know that ſo their Tranſubſtantiation were quite overthrown. But look into the Scripture, and mind it well, and ſee if any thing elſe but Bread can be meant by the word *This*. It's ſaid, *Mat.* 26.26. *Jeſus took Bread and bleſſed it, & brake it, and gave it to the Diſciples, and ſaid, Take, eat, This is my Body.* What is here meant by the word *This?* What is it that Chriſt calls his Body? That which he bade the Diſciples take and eate. And what was that? That which he gave unto them. And what was that? That which he brake.

And

And what was that? That which he bleſſed. And what was that? That which he took. And what was that? Bread. For ſo expreſly the Evangeliſt tells us, that *Jeſus took Bread.* So then it was Bread that Chriſt took, and Bread that he bleſſed, and Bread that he brake, and Bread that he gave to the Diſciples, and Bread that he bade them take and eat, and Bread of which he ſpake, ſaying, *This is my Body.* As if he ſhould ſay, This Bread which I have taken, and bleſſed, and broken, and given unto you to eat, even this Bread is my Body. Now the word *This* relating unto Bread, the ſpeech muſt needs be Figurative, and cannot be Proper. For properly Bread cannot be Chriſts Body, Bread and Chriſts Body, being things of diverſe and different natures, and ſo it being impoſſible that properly one ſhould be the other. As when Chriſt called *Herod* a Fox, and the *Phariſees* Serpents and Vipers, the ſpeeches are not Proper, but Figurative; ſo is it when he called Bread his Body, it being no more poſſible that Bread ſhould be the Body of Chriſt in propriety of ſpeech, then that a man ſhould properly be a Fox, a Serpent, a Viper. Beſides, doth not the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 11. ſpeaking of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, continually call it Bread, even after Conſecration? Indeed, to diſtinguiſh it from ordinary and common Bread, he calls it *This Bread*; but yet ſtill Bread, the ſame in ſubſtance, though not the ſame in uſe, as before. And (which is worthy to be obſerved) thus the Apoſtle calls it, *viz. Bread,* when he ſharply reproves the *Corinthians* for their unworthy receiving of the Sacrament, ſetting before them the grievouſneſſe of the ſin, and the greatneſſe of the danger that they did incur by it. Now what had been more forcible and effectuall to this end, than for the Apoſtle, if he had been of the Romiſh Faith, to have told them, that now it was not Bread, though it ſeemed unto them to be ſo, but that the ſubſtance of the Bread was gone, and inſtead thereof was come the very ſubſtance of Chriſts Body? He ſaith indeed, That *whoſo eat that Bread, and drink the Cup of the Lord unworthily, are guilty of the Body and Bloud of the Lord:* But that is, becauſe that Bread, and that Cup, (*i.e.* the Wine in the Cup) are by the Lords own inſtitution Signes and Seales of the Lords Body and Bloud; ſo that the unworthy receiving of them is an indignity done to the things ſignified by them. But to return to the

Diſparatum de diſparato non poteſt univocè prædicari.

Marqueſſe,

Marqueſſe, he citeth ſundry paſſages in *John 6.* where our Saviour ſpeakes of eating his fleſh, and drinking his blood, calling himſelfe *Bread, living Bread*, and affirming that *his Fleſh is meat indeed, and his Blood drinke indeed.* But all this is farre from proving that reall preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, which the Marqueſſe doth contend for. For, 1. as *Janſenius* (not to name other of the Marqueſſes own party) hath unanſwerably proved, Chriſt in *John 6.* did not treat of the Sacrament, but onely of the ſpirituall eating of his Fleſh, and the ſpirituall drinking of his Blood by faith. 2. The words of our Saviour *John 6.* if they muſt prove any tranſubſtantiation at all, will ſooner prove the tranſubſtantiation of Chriſts body into Bread, then the tranſubſtantiation of Bread into Chriſts body. *I am the Bread of life*, ſaith he, *John 6.35.& 48. I am the living Bread*, &c. *ver.51. My fleſh is meat indeed, &c. ver.55.* If theſe ſayings bee taken properly, and without a figure, they will prove a converſion, not of Bread into the body of Chriſt, but of the Body of Chriſt into Bread. And the argument that * *Bradwardine* uſeth againſt the Idols of the *Pagans*, is by full proportion of as much force againſt our adverſaries tranſubſtantiation. *Perhaps* (ſaith he) *it is anſwered, that a materiall Idoll after conſecration rightly performed, is tranſubſtantiated and turned into God.——This converſion* (viz. *of the Idoll into God*) *is refelled, becauſe it appears to every ſenſe, all experience bearing witneſſe, that there is the ſame materiall Idoll that was before. Therefore if there be any converſion made, it ſeemes rather that God is converted into the Idoll, then that the Idoll is converted into God.* This argument, I ſay, doth as ſtrongly militate againſt the opinion of the Romaniſts concerning the reall preſence. For it no leſſe appears, to every ſenſe, all experience bearing witneſſe, that there's the ſame materiall Bread that was before. Therefore if there be any converſion made, it ſeemes rather that Chriſts Body is converted into the Bread, then that the Bread is converted into Chriſts Body.

Ianſen. Concord. cap. 59.

* Forſitan reſpondetur quòd idolum materiale poſt conſecrationem ritè factam totum tranſubſtantiatur convertiturque in Deum.——Hæc converſio refellitur, quia videtur cuilibet ſenſui, omni experimento teſtante, quòd ibi ſit idem idolum materiale quod prius. Quarè ſi aliqua converſio ibi fiat, magis videtur Deum converti in idolum, quàm è contrà. *Bradward: de cauſâ Dei l. 1. c. 1.*

Page 58. The Marqueſſe ſaith that we with the *Jewes* and *Infidells* ſay, *How can this man give us his fleſh to eate ? Joh.6.52.* But we ſay no ſuch thing. How ſhould wee, if wee believe Chriſt ſaying, *except yee eate the fleſh of the Son of man, and drinke his Blood, you have no life in you ? verſ.53.* We know and acknowledge, that we muſt eate the fleſh of Chriſt, but yet ſpiritually, not (as thoſe unbelieving *Jewes* imagined, being therein more like unto our Adverſaries) carnally. For ſo our Adverſaries hold, that the wicked may eate the fleſh of Chriſt, and yet be never the better, but receive it to their condemnation: whereas the eating of Chriſts Fleſh ſpoken of *Joh. 6.* is a thing that doth accompany ſalvation. † *Who ſo eateth my Fleſh and drinketh my Blood, hath eternall life, &c. v.54.*

† See *Ianſen.* upon thoſe words, Concord. cap. 59.

Page 58. But ſaith the Marqueſſe, *Had this been but a figure, certainly Chriſt would have removed the doubt, when he ſaw them ſo offended at the reality.* Joh.6.61. *He would not have confirmed his ſaying* in terminis, *with promiſe of a greater wonder,* Joh.6.62. *You may as well deny his Incarnation, his Aſcenſion, and aske, How could the man come down from Heaven, and goe up againe ?*

I anſwer, 1. A figure, *viz.* in ſpeech, is not properly oppoſed to reality, but to propriety. The ſpirituall eating of Chriſts Fleſh, is a reall, yet not a proper, but a figurative, a metaphoricall eating of it: when Chriſt ſaith, *I am the true Vine,* Joh. 15.1. there is a reality implied, as well as when he ſaith, *My fleſh is meate indeed,* Joh.6.55. yet no Romaniſt (I preſume) but will grant, that Chriſt is a Vine, not properly, but figuratively ſo called. *True Vine,* that is, excellent, incorruptible and ſpirituall Vine, as * *Janſenius* out of *Euthymius* doth expound it. So *meate indeed,* that is, excellent, incomparable and ſpirituall meate.

* Vitis vera, id eſt, eximia, incorruptibilis, & ſpiritualis. *Ianſen. ex Euthymio Concord. cap.* 135.

2. For thoſe words of our Saviour, *John 6.62. What and if ye ſhall ſee the Son of man aſcend up where he was before ?* they make nothing for our Adverſaries, but rather againſt them. For our Saviour in thoſe words moſt probably intended to let the Jewes ſee, that he did not ſpeak of a Carnall eating of his Fleſh, as they

they ſuppoſed, but of a Spirituall eating of it. So *Auſtine* underſtood thoſe words, as *Janſenius* notes, and judgeth that expoſition moſt probable. And ſo the Jeſuite *Maldonate*, who cites *Beda* and *Rupertus* as following the ſame expoſition, confeſſeth that expoſition more probable than any other that he met with. Yea, that he had no Author of that Interpretation which he embraced, *viz. What Will ye doe when ye ſhall ſee me aſcend into Heaven? How much more then Will ye be offended? How much leſſe will ye then believe?* Yet he ſaith that he did approve this rather then that of *Auſtine*, though of all the reſt moſt probable, becauſe this did more oppoſe the ſenſe of the Calviniſts, which to him (he ſaith) was a great argument of the probability of it. Here ſee, and obſerve the diſpoſition of a Jeſuit, what little reckoning he made of Fathers, ſo he might but oppoſe Calviniſts. *Bellarmine* alſo thinks this a very literall expoſition, that Chriſts meaning was to ſhew that they ſhould have greater cauſe to doubt after his Aſcenſion then they had before. And this expoſition he ſaith ſeems to be *Chryſoſtomes*; yet *Janſenius* attributeth another expoſition unto *Chryſoſtome*, and *Maldonate* confeſſeth that he found none to expound it in that manner. Neither is this expoſition agreeable to the letter. For it is equally inconceiveable, that Chriſt being on Earth, ſhould give his Fleſh to many thouſands to eat, if it be meant of Carnall eating, as that he ſhould doe it being in Heaven. But *Bellarmine* firſt hath another expoſition of thoſe words of our Saviour, which here the Marqueſſe ſeemeth to follow, *viz.* that our Saviour would confirme one wonderfull thing by another no leſſe wonderfull, if not more, he means the wonderfull eating of his Fleſh (in their ſenſe) by his wonderfull Aſcenſion into Heaven. And this expoſition, he ſaith, doth confirm their opinion; for that, if Chriſt had not promiſed to give his true Fleſh in the Sacrament, he needed not to prove his power by his Aſcenſion. I anſwer, it doth argue an extraordinary power in Chriſt to give his Fleſh to eat, though there be no turning of the ſubſtance of the Bread in the Sacrament into the ſubſtance of his Fleſh. *Bellarmine* indeed ſaith, it

Janſen. Concord. cap. 59.

Non nego me hujus interpretationis authorem habere neminem (ſcil. Quid facietis cum videritis me aſcendentem in cœlum? quanto magis ſcandalizabimini? quanto minus credetis?) ſed hanc eò magis probo, quàm illam alteram Auguſtini, cæterarum alioqui probabiliſſimam, quòd hæc cum Calviniſtarum ſenſu magis pugnet, quod mihi magnum eſt probabilitatis argumentum. *Maldon. ad Joh. 6. 62.*

Bell. de Euchar. lib. 1. cap. 6.

Bell. Ibid.

Bell. Ibid.

is no miracle (ſuch as the Jewes required of Chriſt, *Joh:* 6.30,31.) that common Bread ſhould ſignifie Chriſts Body, or that Chriſts Body ſhould be eaten by Faith. But is this ſo ordinary and eaſie a matter, that common Bread (common for ſubſtance, though not for uſe) ſhould ſo ſignifie the Body of Chriſt, that by the due receiving of it, the very Body of Chriſt ſhould be received, and ſo Chriſt and the Receiver be united together Spiritually, even as Bread, and he that eateth it, are united together Corporally? Is all this nothing, except the Bread be ſubſtantially changed and turned into Chriſts Body? Why then doth *Bellarmine* elſwhere tell us, that the Fathers refer the wonderfull effects of Baptiſme (for of that Sacrament particularly doe almoſt all the Fathers ſpeak, which are cited by him) to Gods Almighty power? I am ſure *Bellarmine* would not have us believe for all this, that the ſubſtance of the water in Baptiſme is changed into any other ſubſtance.

Bell. de effect. Sacram. l 2.c.7. Sect. Calvinus.

Pag. 58, 59. *Where our Saviour tels them* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *thus to argue according to fleſh and bloud, in theſe Words, The fleſh profiteth nothing, and that if they will be enlivened in their underſtanding, they muſt have Faith to believe it in theſe words, It is the Spirit that quickneth,* John 6.63. *They pervert our Saviours meaning into a contrary ſenſe of their own imagination,* viz. *The fleſh profiteth nothing, that is to ſay, Chriſts Body is not in the Sacrament: but it is the Spirit that quickneth, that is to ſay, We muſt onely believe that Chriſt dyed for us, but not that his Body is there. As if there were any need of ſo many inculcations, preſſures, offences, miſ-believings of, and in a thing that were no more but a bare memoriall of a thing, being a thing nothing more uſuall with the Iſraelites, as the* 12. *ſtones which were erected as a ſigne of the children of Iſraels paſſing over Jordan, &c.* Joſh. 4.

Anſw. Thoſe words of our Saviour, *The Fleſh profiteth nothing, It is the Spirit that quickneth,* make alſo rather againſt our Adverſaries opinion, than for it. For as *Janſenius* comments upon them, our Saviour in thoſe words ſignifies, *That his fleſh is to be eaten in ſpirituall manner, and not carnally:* which is that which we hold and maintain againſt them of the Church of *Rome.*

Significat modum, quo caro ejus eſſet edenda, ſpiritualem eſſe, & ſpiritu edendam eſſe, non carnaliter. *Janſen. Concord. cap. 59.*

This

This expoſition (as the ſame *Janſenius* obſerves) doth both anſwer the murmuring of the Jewes, and alſo agree with the ſentence following, *The Words which I have ſpoken unto you, they are ſpirit, and they are life*, that is, they are ſpirituall, and to be underſtood ſpiritually, and ſo they give life to thoſe that hear them. Thus (he ſaith) *Auſtine* doth interpret this ſentence; and a little before he cites *Chryſoſtome*, *Theophylact*, and others, as underſtanding Chriſts words in this ſenſe. 2. To remove thoſe offences, and miſ-beleevings which the Jewes had about the eating of Chriſts Fleſh, which he ſpake of (they underſtanding his words in a carnall ſenſe) there was need enough of ſo many inculcations and preſſures, for we ſee, that after all thoſe inculcations and preſſures yet our Adverſaries will not be taken off from the like Carnall conceit, as the offended and miſ-beleeving Jewes had. Our Adverſaries would ſeeme indeed to be far from compliance with thoſe Jewes, becauſe they doe not hold that Chriſts Fleſh is to be eaten by bits, ſo as to be divided one piece from another (as thoſe Jewes ſeeme to have imagined) but that it is to be eaten, though corporally, yet in an inviſible, and indiviſible manner. But Pope *Nicolas* cauſed *Berengarius* to recant his opinion, and to confeſſe, *That not only the Sacrament of Chriſts Body, but the very body it ſelfe is ſenſually held in the Prieſts hands, and torne by the Teeth of the Faithfull.* Which expreſſions are as harſh as our Adverſaries can uſe, when they would ſet forth the groſneſſe of that conceit which the Jewes had about eating Chriſts Fleſh.

Et ſcut hæc explicatio optimè reſpondet murmurantium verbis, ita & ſequenti ſententiæ congruit, Verba quæ locutus ſum vobis, ſpiritus & vita ſunt, hoc eſt, ſunt ſpiritualia, & ſpiritualiter intelligenda, ac ſic auditori conferunt vitam. Sic enim hanc ſententiam etiam Auguſtinus enarrat. *Janſen. Ibid.*

Ore & corde confiteor, &c. panem & vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, poſt conſecrationem non ſolùm Sacramentum, ſed etiam verum corpus & ſanguinem D. N. Jeſu Chriſti eſſe, & ſenſualiter non ſolùm ſacramentum, ſed in veritate manibus ſacerdotum tractari, frangi, fidelium dentibus atteri. *De Conſecr. diſt. 2. c. 42. Ego Berengar.*

And indeed ſo harſh are thoſe expreſſions in *Berengarius* his recantation preſcribed by the Pope, that the Gloſſe upon it is forced to ſay, *Except you rightly underſtand the Words of* Berengarius, (hee might have ſaid of Pope *Nicolas*, who did preſcribe them) *you will fall into a greater Hereſie, then he was in. And therefore you*

Niſi ſanè intelligas verba *Berengarii*, in majorem incides hæreſin, quàm ipſe habuit: & ideò omnia referas ad ſpecies ipſas: nam de Chriſti corpore partes non facimus. *Gloſ.*

muſt referre all to the ſpecies (or *ſhewes*) *themſelves; for We doe not make any parts of Chriſts Body.* So then to free themſelves from a Capernaiticall manner of eating Chriſts Fleſh, our adverſaries hold, that neither Chriſts body, nor bread, but onely the *ſpecies*, or ſhewes of bread, as quantity, colour, ſavour, and the like, meere accidents without a ſubſtance, are torne with the teeth, divided and broken. And is this properly to eate Chriſts Body? or is not this eating of Chriſts Fleſh as imaginable as that of the *Jewes?* whereas the Marqueſſe ſpeaketh of *a bare memoriall*; 1. Chriſt himſelfe hath plainly taught us, that the Sacrament is a memoriall of him, ſaying, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* 2. We doe not ſay, that Chriſt is barely remembred in the Sacrament, but ſo remembred; as alſo to be received, *viz.* by ſuch as have faith whereby to receive him. For to receive Chriſt, is to believe in him, as is cleare *Joh.* 1. 12. So that this receiving of Chriſt, though it be a reall, yet it is not a corporall, but a ſpirituall receiving of him.

Page 67. After the Scriptures, the Marqueſſe cites ſome Fathers, as *Ignatius Epiſt. ad Smyr. Juſtine Apol. 2. Cyprian Ser. 4. de Lapſ. Ambroſ. l. 4. de Sacram. and Remigius* (the place where not noted) who (he ſaith) affirme the fleſh of Chriſt to be in the Sacrament, and the ſame fleſh, which the Word of God tooke in the Virgins Wombe.

Anſw. The queſtion is not whether Chriſts Fleſh be in the Sacrament, but how it is in it, concerning which theſe Fathers, ſo farre as the Marqueſſe doth ſhew, ſpeake nothing: To ſay, that they ſpeake *of the ſame fleſh, which the Word of God tooke in the Wombe of the Virgin*, is onely to ſhew that they ſpeake of Chriſts fleſh properly ſo called, but it doth not ſhew that they ſpeake of that fleſh being properly in the Sacrament. I know no fleſh of Chriſt properly ſo called, but that, which *the Word made Fleſh* (*Joh.* 1. 14) tooke of the Virgin *Mary*: but though it be granted (as it is) that this fleſh of Chriſt is in the Sacrament, yet ſtill the queſtion remaines whether this fleſh of Chriſt be properly, ſubſtantially, and corporally in the Sacrament, *viz.* under the *ſpecies*, or ſhewes of bread, as our Adverſaries hold; and to this queſtion the Marqueſſe doth not ſay that the Fathers alledged by him, doe ſpeake any thing: and therefore I

might

might well let them paſſe without any further anſwer.

But to conſider them, and their teſtimonies more particularly. Firſt, *Ignatius* his words (as they are cited by *Bellarmine*) are to this effect, *They* (meaning certaine Hereticks) *doe not admit Euchariſts, and oblations, becauſe they doe not confeſſe the Euchariſt to be the fleſh of our Saviour, which did ſuffer for our ſins, and which the Father of his goodneſſe did raiſe up.* This teſtimony is nothing againſt us, who doe not deny the Euchariſt, that is, the bread in the Euchariſt to be the fleſh of Chriſt, onely wee ſay that it is not his fleſh in a proper, but in a figurative ſenſe, *viz.* (as *Auſtine* in the words before cited obſerves) the thing ſignifying being called by the name of the thing ſignified. And this muſt be the meaning of *Ignatius*; for hee ſpeakes, not of Chriſts fleſh being in the Euchariſt, but of the Euchariſt being Chriſts Fleſh. Whereby the Euchariſt can be meant nothing but the Sacramentall bread, and that (as I have before demonſtrated) by the confeſſion of all cannot properly, but onely figuratively be Chriſts Fleſh. *Bellarmine* objects, that the Hereticks ſpoken of by *Ignatius*, denyed Chriſt to have true fleſh, holding that he was but ſeemingly borne, crucified, and raiſed againe. And therefore (hee ſaith) they did not deny the Euchariſt to ſignifie the fleſh of Chriſt, but onely to be the Fleſh of Chriſt, leſt they ſhould be forced to admit that Chriſt had true fleſh. But (ſay I) how could thoſe Hereticks yeeld that Euchariſt doth ſignifie the fleſh of Chriſt, and yet deny that Chriſt hath fleſh? For a thing muſt needs firſt be, before there can be truly any ſignification of it. Men (ſaith *Bellarmine*) may paint bodies, which indeed are not. But who will ſay that theſe Pictures are repreſentations of bodies, and not meere Pictures? And this is all that *Bellarmine* could make out of *Ignatius*. The next Father is * *Juſtine Martyr*, who ſaith that *the Bread in the Sacrament, is not common Bread, nor the Cup a common Cup.* We ſay the ſame, they are not common, being ſanctified, and ſet apart for a holy uſe. But doth this prove any tranſubſtantiation? our adverſaries hold no ſubſtantiall change of the water in Baptiſme

Bell. de Euchar. l. 2. c. 2.

Bell. Ibid.

* οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν. *Juſtin. Apol. 2.*

tiſme, and yet they will not ſay, that it is common water; I am ſure it is farre more juſtly to be accounted Holy, than that which they uſe to call *Holy Water*.

Τὴν δι' ἐυχῆς λόγυ τῦ θεῦ παρ' αὐτὸ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνυ τῦ σαρκοποιηθέντ@ Ἰησῦ καὶ σάρκα, καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. *Juſtin. Ibid.*

Juſtine alſo ſaith, That *We are taught, that the food in the Euchariſt, by which being changed, our fleſh and bloud is nouriſhed, is the fleſh and bloud of that Ieſus that was incarnate.* But this was ſo far from proving Tranſubſtantiation, that indeed it overthrowes it: For in ſaying that we are nouriſhed by the food, the Bread and the Wine in the Sacrament, he ſaith in effect that the ſubſtance of that food, that Bread and Wine, doth ſtill remaine; for otherwiſe how ſhould we be nouriſhed by it? Chriſts Body and Bloud are not for our corporall nouriſhment, of which *Juſtine* ſpeaketh; neither can the bare *Species*, or ſhewes of Bread and Wine afford any ſuch nouriſhment.

Bell. de Eucha. l. 2. c. 4.

But (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *Juſtine* writing an Apology for Chriſtians, and their Religion, was a prevaricatour, and made the Chriſtian Faith moſt odious, by expreſſing himſelf ſo as he did, whereas he might have avoided all ſuperſtition, if he had believed that Chriſt is not ſo in the Sacrament, as that the Bread is ſubſtantially changed, and turned into his Body. I anſwer, that *Juſtines* expreſſions are agreeable to our Saviours: 1. *This is my Body*, and therefore no more apt to render the Faith of Chriſtians odious than the other. Neither was it much to be feared, that the Heathens, to whom he wrote his Apology, ſhould not be able to underſtand the Figure, whereby the ſigne is called that which it ſignifieth; there was no need (as *Bellarmine* ſcoffingly ſpeakes) that for the underſtanding of this Figure they ſhould be converſant in the School of the Calviniſts.

Opinatur fortaſſe Petrus Martyr Imperatorem illum verſatum fuiſſe in Scholâ Calviniſtarum, ut ſtatim ad tropos omnia revocaret. *Bellar. Ibid.*

The next Father cited by the Marqueſſe is *Cyprian*, who ſpeaking of ſome, that in time of Perſecution denyed the Faith, and yet preſumed to receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper; to let them ſee the hainouſneſſe of their preſumption, he firſt alledged ſome places of Scripture, as *Levit.* 7. 19, 20. and 1 *Cor.* 10. 21. and

11,

11. 27. And then he addes, *All theſe things being deſpiſed and contemned, violence is offered to Chriſts Body and Bloud; and they now ſinne againſt the Lord more by their hands and mouth, then they did before when* that *they denyed him.* But what is there in all this to ſhew *Cyprian* held any ſuch preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, as they of the Romiſh Church maintaine? Yes (ſaith *Bellarmine*, for the Marqueſſe onely points at places, but cites no words, much leſſe drawes any argument from them) *Cyprian* did certainly beleeve Chriſt to be ſo in the Sacrament, or elſe he would never have ſo aggravated the unworthy receiving of the Sacrament, as to make it a greater ſinne than to deny Chriſt before a perſecutor. But this reaſon is over-weak. For firſt, *Cyprian* being very Rhetoricall, might a little hyperbolize in his expreſſion. And 2. without any Hyperbole at all the words may be made good, and yet no Tranſubſtantiation, nor any corporall preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament be ſuppoſed. For the ſin of denying Chriſt under Perſecution might be (and moſt probably was) of infirmity; and the ſinne of receiving the Sacrament unworthily might be of preſumption, and ſo more hainous in that reſpect than the other. In the ſame place *Cyprian* alſo relates ſome miraculous puniſhments which were inflicted on ſome that unworthily received the Sacrament: and hence alſo *Bellarmine* infers that Chriſt is corporally preſent in the Sacrament, for that we doe not read (he ſayes) of any ſuch miracles ſhewed upon thoſe who have unworthily medled with other Signes. I anſwer, yes, we doe; we read of *Nadab* and *Abihu* ſlain with fire from Heaven, for offering Incenſe with ſtrange Fire, *Levit.* 10. and yet that Incenſe, and the Altar on which it was offered, were but Types and Figures. So the Arke was but a Signe of Gods Preſence, and yet many thouſands of the *Bethſhemites* were deſtroyed for looking into it, 1 *Sam.* 6. 4. ſo alſo was *Uzza* for preſuming to touch it, 2 *Sam.* 6.

Spretis his omnibus, atque contemptis vis infertur corpori ejus, & ſanguini; & plus modò in Dominum manibus atque ore delinquunt, quàm cum Dominum negaverunt. *Cypr. de Lapſ.*

Bell. de Euchar. lib. 2. *cap.* 9.

Bell. Ibid.

Next to *Cyprian*, the Marqueſſe cites, *Ambroſe Lib.* 4. *de Sacram.* but no Chapter is cited by him. *Bellarmine* cites Chap. 3, 4, and 5. Now all that *Ambroſe* ſaith, chap. 3. as look-

Accipe quæ dico, anteriora eſſe myſteria Chriſtianorum quàm Judeorum, & diviniora eſſe Sacramenta. *Ambroſ. de Sacram. lib.* 4 *cap.* 3.

ing that way, is but this, That *the Sacraments of Christians are more Divine then those of the Jewes.* Which we grant, not in respect of the thing signified, *For Jesus Christ yesterday, and to day, and the same for ever, Heb.* 13. the same Christ was signified by the Jewish Sacraments as by ours: but in respect of the manner of signifying, Christ being more clearly signified by our Sacraments, than he was by those which the Jewes had. See 2 *Cor.*3. 12. &c.

Sed panis iste, panis est ante verba Sacramentorũ; ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi. *Ambros. de Sacram. l.* 4. *c.* 4.

But chap. 4. *Ambrose* hath something that may seem to make more against us, *viz.* That *before Consecration it is Bread, but when Consecration commeth, then of Bread it is made the Flesh of Christ.*

To this I answer, that these words doe not inferre any Transubstantiation. By Consecration, of Bread is made Christs Flesh, but Sacramentally, not Substantially; Figuratively, not Properly. And that *Ambrose* in those words did intend no substantiall change of the Bread, appears by his owne words in the same Chapter. *If* (saith he) *there was such force in the speech of the Lord Jesus, that things should begin to be that were not: how much more operative is it, that those things should be, which were, and should withall be changed into another thing?* Therefore in the judgement of *Ambrose*, the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are what they were, *viz.* in respect of substance, yet by vertue of Christs institution are changed, *viz.* in respect of signification.

Si ergò tanta vis est in sermone Domini Jesu, ut inciperent esse, quæ non erant; quanto magis operatorius est, ut sint quæ erant, & in aliud commutentur? *Ambros. Ibid.*

Bell. ubi supra. *Bellarmine*, to evade this testimony, first sayes, that *Lanfrancus* in his book against *Berengarius* speaks of some Copies of *Ambrose* his Workes, wherein those words were not, *Ut sint quæ erant*, that is, *That those things should be which were.* But no such Copies either Printed, or Manuscript, it seems did *Bellarmine* meet with; for otherwise (I doubt not) he would have given us notice of them. Again, with the same *Lanfrancus* he answers, that those words are thus to be understood, that in respect of outward shew, the things which were, still are, but are changed in respect of inward substance. But how can a thing be said to be what it was, when as there is no substance of the thing remaining, but onely a shew and appearance of it? In the last place *Bellarmine* addes

addes of his own, that *Ambroſe* meant, If Chriſt could make a thing of nothing, why can he not make a thing of ſomething, not by annihilating the thing, but by changing it into that which is better? But if a thing be changed ſubſtantially into another thing, how doth it remain what it was before? But ſo the things doe, that *Ambroſe* ſpeaks of. For *Bellarmines* criticiſme is poor in diſtinguiſhing betwixt, *Ut ſint id, quod erant*, *That they ſhould be that which they were*, and *Ut ſint quæ erant*, *That the things ſhould be that were*, as if theſe words did not import that the ſame ſubſtances ſtill remain, as well as the other when Chriſt turned Water into Wine, can we ſay, that his Word was operative, and powerfull, *Ut eſſet quod erat, & in aliud mutaretur*, *That that ſhould be which was, and that withall, it ſhould be changed into another thing?* I confeſſe I cannot ſee how the thing may be ſaid truly and properly to be, which was, if it be ſubſtantially changed into ſome other thing. *Ambroſe* there a little after ſaith, *Tu ipſe eras, ſed eras vetus creatura: poſteaquam conſecratus es, nova creatura eſſe cœpiſti. Thou thy ſelf waſt, but thou waſt an old creature: after thou art conſecrated, thou beginneſt to be a new creature*: which cannot be meant of any ſubſtantiall change in us. Chap. 5. the ſame *Ambroſe*, (if it were *Ambroſe*, for *Bellarmine* is not very confident that *Ambroſe* was the Author of thoſe Books, *De Sacramentis*) ſaith indeed, That *before it is Conſecrated, it is Bread, but when the words of Chriſt are come, it is the Body of Chriſt*. But that it is ſo the Body of Chriſt, as to be no longer Bread he doth not affirme. That he was of another mind, appears by the words before alledged. And ſo much alſo may be gathered from that which he ſaith in this ſame Chapter, *viz. He that did eat Manna, dyed: but whoſo eateth this Body, ſhall have remiſſion of ſins, and ſhall live for ever*. Which cannot be underſtood of a Corporall eating of Chriſts Body, but of a Spirituall eating of it. *Bellarmine* cites ſome other ſayings of *Ambroſe* out of another Work of his, *viz. De iis, qui myſteriis initiantur*, but they prove no more than theſe already cited, neither doth the Marqueſſe refer us to them. Yea, in that ſame work *Ambroſe* doth ſufficiently declare himſelfe againſt

Antequam conſecretur, panis eſt: ubi autem verba Chriſti acceſſerint, corpus eſt Chriſti. *Ambr. de Sacr l. 4. c. 5.*

Manna qui manducavit, mortuus eſt; qui manducaverit hoc corpus, fiet ei remiſſio peccatorum, & non morietur in æternum. *Ambroſ. Ibid.*

Verè ergò carnis illius Sacramentum est.—— post consecrationem corpus. significatur. *Ambros. de iis qui myster. init. cap. 6.*

Non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritualis est. Unde & Apostolus de typo ejus ait, Quia patres nostri escam spiritualem manducaverunt, & potum spiritualem biberunt. *Ibid.*

againſt Tranſubſtantiation. For there he ſaith, *It is truly the Sacrament of Chriſts Fleſh.* And, *after Conſecration, the Body* (*of Chriſt*) *is ſignified.* And again, *It is not therefore Corporall food, but Spirituall. Whence alſo the Apoſtle ſaith of the Type of it, that our Fathers did eat Spirituall meat, and did drink Spirituall drink,* 1 Cor. 10. The laſt Author *Remigius*, is onely cited by the Marqueſſe at large, neither doe I find him cited by *Bellarmine* at all, and therefore untill we have ſome particular place cited out of him, it is in vain to trouble our ſelves about him; beſides, that his Antiquity is not ſuch, as that his Authority ſhould much be ſtood upon, being 890 years after Chriſt, as *Bellarmine* ſheweth in his book of Eccleſiaſticall Writers.

Pag. 59, & 60. *Secondly*, (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *We hold that there is in the Church an infallible Rule for underſtanding of Scripture, beſides the Scripture it ſelf. This you deny, this we have Scripture for, as* Rom. 12. 6. *We muſt* prophecy according to the Rule of Faith. *We are bid to* walke according to this Rule, *Gal.* 6. 16. *We muſt* encreaſe our Faith, and preach the Goſpell according to this Rule, 2 *Cor.* 10. 15. *This rule of Faith the Holy Scriptures call* a forme of Doctrine, *Rom.* 6. 17. a thing made ready to our hands, 2 *Cor.* 10. 16. that we may not meaſure our ſelves by our ſelves, 2 *Cor.* 10. 12. the depoſitions committed to the Churches truſt, 1 *Tim.* 6. 20. for avoiding of profane and vaine bablings, and oppoſitions of ſciences, *And by this rule of faith is not meant the Holy Scriptures; for that cannot doe it, as the Apoſtle tells us, whilſt there are unſtable men, who wreſt this way and that way to their own deſtruction; but it is the tradition of the Church, as it is delivered from hand to hand, as moſt plainly appears,* 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. The things which thou haſt heard of us (not received in writing from me or others) among many witneſſes, the ſame commit thou to faithfull men, who ſhall be able to teach it to others alſo.

Anſw. That there is any infallible Rule for underſtanding of Scripture, or any other rule of Faith, beſides the Scripture, we do deny, and that by authority of the Scripture it ſelf. *To the law, and to the teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this Word, it is becauſe they have*

no

no light in them. Isai.8.20. *Search the Scriptures, for in them yee thinke to have eternall life, and they are they that testifie of mee.* Joh.5.39. *These were more noble then they of Thessalonica, in that they received the Word with all readinesse of minde, and searched the Scriptures, whether those things were so.* Acts 17.11. *All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for reproofe, for correction, for instruction in righteousnesse, That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good workes,* 2 *Tim.*3.16.17. Neither doe those places alledged by the Marquesse make for the contrary.

We must *propheſie according to the rule of Faith,* saith the Apostle *Rom.* 12.6. as the Marquesse hath it, following therein the *Rhemists* translation, as also their comment upon the place. But the word in the originall signifies rather *proportion,* then *rule.* And I see not but that by *the proportion of faith* may be understood *the measure of faith,* which is spoken of *vers.* 3. ἀναλογία.

But be it granted, that *proportion of faith* is as much as rule of faith, where doth the Apostle say, that this rule of faith is any other then the Scripture it selfe? The places before cited shew, that we are referred to the Scripture, as the rule, whereby all doctrines are to be tried; but no where doe I finde, that wee are referred to any unwritten tradition. Sure I am our Adversaries can evince no such thing from the words of the Apostle, *Rom.*12.6. Except we must (to use the Marquesses expressions) take them *margin'd with their own notes, sens'd with their own meaning, and enlivened with their own private spirit.* *Page* 53. As for the rule mentioned, *Gal.*6.16. it is no generall rule of faith, or of interpreting Scripture, but a speciall rule, that *in Christ Iesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature*; as is cleare by the context, *ver.*15. *As many as walke according to this rule,* that is, (as * *Oecumenius* expounds it) *as many as are content with this rule, and this doctrine, that all things are made a new creature, and doe not subject themselves to the Law.* Neither is the place, 2 *Cor.*10. 15. to the purpose. For the Apostle there speakes of a ruleby

* ὅσοι φησὶν, τῷ κανόνι τούτῳ, καὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ ταύτῃ ἀρκεσθῶσι, τὸ καινὴν κτίσιν εἶναι τὰ πάντα, καὶ μὴ ὑποθῶσιν ἑαυτὸς τῷ νόμῳ. *Oecum. ad loc.*

way of ſimilitude (as Cardinall * *Cajetan* doth well expound it) *viz.* that as an Architect, or the like chiefe workman, doth by rule divide the worke that is to be done, and appoint under-workemen where they ſhall imploy themſelves, and how farre they ſhall reach: ſo God did as it were by rule appoint *Paul*, where he ſhould preach the Goſpell, and how farre his imployment ſhould extend in that kinde. This plainly appeares to be the Apoſtles meaning by the two verſes immediately preceding, *But we will not boaſt of things without our meaſure, but according to the meaſure of the rule, which God hath diſtributed unto us, a meaſure to reach even unto you. For we ſtretch not our ſelves beyond our meaſure, as though wee reached not unto you; for we are come as farre as you alſo in preaching the Goſpell of Chriſt.* Then he addes, *Not boaſting of things without our meaſure, that is, of other mens labours, but having hope, when your faith is encreaſed, that we ſhall be enlarged by you, according to our rule abundantly, To preach the Goſpell in the regions beyond you, and not to boaſt in another mans line, of things made ready to our hand.* All may plainly ſee, that here is nothing ſpoken of a rule of faith, or a rule for the underſtanding of the Scripture. And therefore moſt impertinently is 2 *Cor.* 10. 16. cited, as if the Apoſtle there did ſpeak of a rule of faith *made ready to their hands*. And ſo alſo is that of *not meaſuring our ſelves by our ſelves*. 2 *Cor.* 10. 12.

Neither can our Adverſaries ever be able to prove that by *the forme of Doctrine* mentioned *Rom.* 6. 17. the Apoſtle did meane any other Doctrine, then what is contained in the Scripture: or that any Doctrine, but the Doctrine of the Scripture is meant by that *which was committed to Timotheus truſt*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 20. which the Apoſtle there bids him *keepe, avoiding profane, and vaine bablings, &c.* Though ſuch as are *unlearned, and unſtable wreſt the Scriptures, &c.* 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. yet the ſame Apoſtle in the ſame Epiſtle doth teach us *to take heed to the Scripture, as to a light ſhining in a darke place*. 2 *Pet.* 1. 19.

That

* Loquitur Paulus ad ſimilitudinem filorum, quibus artifices utuntur pro regulis operum efficiendorum. Archimagiſter ſiquidem præſidens univerſo operi fabricæ, vel colendæ terræ, vel efficiendorum aggerum, filis (quæ regulæ vocantur) diſtinguit partes operis, & juxta regulam cuique datam menſura eſt operis cujuſque. Hâc metaphorâ utitur Paulus, ad ſignificandum quòd materia gloriationis ſuæ eſt menſurarum terrarum ſpatium, in quo hactenus prædicaverat ſecundum regulam, non à ſeipſo, non ab apoſtolis, ſed à Deo; quod terrarum ſpatium pertingebat uſque ad Corinthios. *Cajetan. in* 2. *Cor.* 10.

That the Apoſtle ſpake of any unwritten tradition, as a rule whereby to interpret Scriptures, 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. can never be made good: by the things, which *Timothy* heard him, and was to commit to faithfull men, &c. hee meant nothing but the Doctrine of the Goſpell, as the forementioned * *Cajetan* doth truly interpret: and that Doctrine, I preſume, is no where to be found, but in the Scripture. Surely the Apoſtle in the next Chapter after tells *Timothy*, *that from a child hee had known the holy Scriptures, which were able to make him wiſe unto ſalvation, thorough faith, which is in Chriſt Ieſus.* 2 Tim. 3. 15.

* Evangelicos ſiquidem ſermones intelligit dicendo, & quæ audiſti à me. *Cajet. in* 2 *Tim.* 2.

After the Scriptures, the Marqueſſe cites the Fathers as being of this opinion, *viz. Ireneus l.* 4. *c.* 45. *Tertull. de Præſcript. and Vincent. Lirin. in ſuo Commentario* (perhaps it ſhould be *Commonitorio*) But it will not appeare, that the Fathers held any rule of faith, and of interpreting the Scripture, beſides the Scripture it ſelfe. His Majeſty (as I noted before) cited above twice as many Fathers, as the Marqueſſe here alledgeth, plainly teſtifying that the Scriptures are their own interpreters, and that matters of faith are to be decided by them. I will adde a few more teſtimonies of the Fathers to this purpoſe. a *As wee doe not deny* (ſaith *Hierome*) *thoſe things which are written, ſo we refuſe thoſe things, which are not written.* b *I adore* (ſaith *Tertullian*) *the fulneſſe of the Scripture.* And againe, c *Let Hermogenes* (ſaith hee) *ſhew that it is written. If it be not written, let him feare that woe appointed for thoſe that either adde to the Scripture, or detract from it.* d *Wee doe Cyprian no wrong* (ſaith *Auſtine*) *when wee diſtinguiſh any of his writings from the canonicall authority of the Divine Scriptures. For not without cauſe is ſuch a wholeſome Eccleſiaſticall rule of vigilancy conſtituted, to which certaine Bookes of the Prophets and the Apoſtles belong, which we may not at all dare to judge, and according to which wee may freely judge of other writings, whether they bee of Beleevers,*

Page 60 *and* 61.

Page 50.

a Ut hæc, quæ ſcripta ſunt, non negamus, ita ea, quæ non ſunt ſcripta, renuimus. *Hieron. adverſ. Helvid.*

b Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem. *Tertull. contra Hermog. cap.* 22.

c Scriptum eſſe doceat *Hermogenis* officina. Si non eſt ſcriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus, aut detrahentibus deſtinatum. *Tertull. Ibid.*

d Nos nullam Cypriano facimus injuriam, cum ejus quaſlibet literas à canonicâ divinarum Scripturarum authoritate diſtinguimus. Neque enim ſine cauſâ tam ſaluber vigilantiæ canon Eccleſiaſticus conſtitutus eſt, ad quem certi Prophetarum & Apoſtolorum libri pertineant, quos omninò judicare non audeamus, & ſecundum quos de cæteris literis vel fidelium, vel infidelium liberè judicemus. *Aug. contra Creſcon. lib.* 2. *cap.* 31.

or

Ego Epiſtolæ hujus authoritate non teneor, quia literas *Cypriani* non ut Canonicas habeo, ſed eas ex Canonicis conſidero, & quod in eis divinarum Scripturarum authoritati congruit, cum laude ejus accipio, quod autem non congruit, cum pace ejus reſpuo. *Aug. ibid.*

or of unbelievers. And againe, *I am not bound* (ſaith hee) *by the authority of this Epiſtle* (viz. of Cyprian) *becauſe I doe not account* Cyprians *writings as Canonicall, but I examine them by thoſe that are Canonicall, and that which is in them agreeable to the authority of the Divine Scriptures, I receive and what is not agreeable, I refuſe with his leave.* For the Fathers here cited by the Marqueſſe, * *Irenæus lib.4. cap.* 45. hath nothing that may ſeeme to make that way except this, *Where* (ſaith hee) *the gifts of the Lord are placed, there wee ought to learne truth, of thoſe with whom is that ſucceſſion of the Church, which is from the Apoſtles, and that ſound ſpeech not to be reproved. For they keepe that faith of ours, which is in one God, that made all things, and increaſe that love, which is towards the Son of God, who did ſuch great things for us, and they without danger expound unto us the Scriptures, neither blaſpheming God, nor diſhonoring the Patriarcks, nor contemning the Prophets.* Here *Irenæus* ſpeakes of ſome, of whom truth was to be learnt, who kept the faith, and did expound the Scriptures without danger: but hee doth not ſay, that they had any unwritten rule of faith, or any ſuch rule, whereby to expound the Scriptures. No; for ſo *Irenæus* ſhould not agree with himſelfe, who ſaith (as His Majeſty obſerved) *that the evidences, which are in the Scriptures, cannot be manifeſted but by the Scriptures themſelves.*

* Ubi igitur charismata Domini poſita ſunt, ibi diſcere oportet veritatem, apud quos eſt ea, quæ eſt ab Apoſtolis, Eccleſiæ ſucceſſio, & id, quod eſt ſanum, irreprobabile ſermonis conſtat. Hi enim & eam, quæ eſt in unum Deum, qui omnia fecit, fidem noſtram cuſtodiunt, & eam, quæ eſt in filium Dei, dilectionem adaugent, qui tantas diſpoſitiones propter nos fecit, & Scripturas ſine periculo nobis exponunt, neque Deum blaſphemantes, neque Patriarchas exhonorantes, neque prophetas contemnentes. *Iren. lib.4. cap.45.*

Oſtenſiones, quæ ſunt in Scripturis, non poſſunt oſtendi niſi ex ipſis Scripturis. *Iren. lib 3. cap.12.*

Adde hereunto another ſaying of the Father very pertinent to the purpoſe. *We have not known* (ſaith hee) *the diſpenſation of our ſalvation but by thoſe, by whom the Goſpell came unto us: which Goſpell they preached, and afterward by the Will of God delivered unto us in the Scriptures, as that which ſhould be for the foundation and pillar*

Non per alios diſpoſitionem ſalutis noſtræ, quàm per eos, per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem præconiaverunt, poſteà verò per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtræ futurum. *Iren. lib.3. cap.1.*

pillar of our Faith. So much for *Irenæus*; The Marqueſſe cites the words of *Tertullian*, and ſo of *Vincentius*: *Tertullians* words (as he cites them) are theſe, *Wee doe not admit our adverſaries to diſpute out of Scripture, till they can ſhew, Who their anceſtors were, and from Whom they received the Scriptures. For the ordinary courſe of Doctrine requires, that the firſt queſtion ſhould be, from whom, and by Whom, and to Whom the forme of Chriſtian Religion was delivered, otherwiſe preſcribing againſt him as a ſtranger.* Theſe words I cannot finde, nor any like unto them in the place cited, *viz. de Præſcrip. cap.* 11. elſewhere indeed in that booke I finde words like unto theſe, though not the ſame. However if wee ſhould be tried by theſe words, I ſee not how they *will* conclude againſt us. For though the Heretickes, with whom *Tertullian* had to doe, might be convinced otherwiſe then by Scripture, it followes not, that therefore this is not the ordinary way whereby to convince Hereticks. Thus Chriſt convinced the *Sadduces* that denied the Reſurrection, *Mat.* 22.29. &c. thus *Apollos* convinced the Jewes, who denied Jeſus to be the Chriſt: *Acts* 18.28. And thus the Apoſtles convinced thoſe that urged Circumciſion, and the obſerving of the Jewiſh Law, *Acts* 15.15. &c. And thus both other Fathers, and even *Tertullian* himſelfe doth uſually diſpute againſt Heretickes, and confute them by the Scriptures.

But (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *If a Heathen ſhould come by the Bible, as the Eunuch came by the prophecy of* Eſay, *and have no* Philip *to interpret it unto him, hee would find out a Religion rather according to his own fancy, then Divine verity.* Be it ſo, yet here is nothing to prove, that this *Philip*, that is to interpret the Bible, is not to fetch his interpretation from the Bible it ſelfe, but from ſome unwritten tradition. I come to *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, whoſe words produced by the Marqueſſe, run thus, *It is very needfull in regard of ſo many errors proceeding from miſinterpretations of Scriptures, that the line of propheticall and Apoſtolicall expoſition ſhould be directed according to the rule of the Eccleſiaſticall and Catholike ſenſe.* But I ſee not, that in the opinion of *Vincentius, the rule of the Eccleſiaſticall and Catholike ſenſe* is any other then the Scripture. He inſiſts much (I am ſure) upon thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *If wee, or an Angell*

*from heaven preach any other Goſpell unto you, then that which We have preached unto you, let him be accurſed, Gal.*1.8. Now, as was noted before out of *Irenæus*, the Goſpell, which the Apoſtles preached, they delivered unto us in the Scriptures, and that is the foundation and pillar of our Faith.

Indeed, all that *Vincentius* in his Commonitory againſt Hereſies, aimes at, is this, That *the Faith once delivered to the Saints* (as Saint *Jude* ſpeaks) might be preſerved. To which end he deſcants well upon thoſe words of the Apoſtle: *O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy truſt*, 1 Tim. 6. 20. *That which is committed to thee, not that which is invented by thee; that which thou haſt received, not that which thou haſt deviſed; a matter not of wit, but of doctrine; not of private uſurpation, but of publick tradition; a thing brought unto thee, not brought forth by thee, in which thou art not to be an author, but a keeper; not an ordainer, but an obſerver; not a leader, but a follower.* That this *Depoſitum*, or thing committed to *Timothy*, was any unwritten Tradition, and not the doctrine of the Goſpell contained in the Scripture; neither doth *Vincentius* ſay, neither can it be proved. *Bellarmine* himſelf is forced to confeſſe, That *all things neceſſary for all, are written by the Apoſtles:* Yea, and that *thoſe things which have the teſtimony of Tradition* (he means unwritten tradition) *received in the whole Church, are not uſually ſuch as concern moſt obſcure queſtions.* And how then ſhould ſuch Tradition be the Rule of Faith, and of Expounding the Scriptures?

Jude, ver. 3.

Id quod tibi creditum eſt, non quod à te inventum; quod acceptiſti, non quod excogitaſti; rem non ingenii, ſed doctrinæ; non uſurpationis privatæ, ſed publicæ traditionis: rem ad te perductam, non à te prolatam; in quâ non autor debes eſſe, ſed cuſtos; non inſtitutor, ſed ſectator; non ducens, ſed ſequens. *Vincent. loc. citat.*

Dico illa omnia ſcripta eſſe ab Apoſtolis, quæ ſunt omnibus neceſſaria, &c. *Bellarm. de Verbo non ſcripto lib.* 4. *c.* 11.

Loquitur Origenes de obſcuriſſimis quæſtionibus, quales ut plurimùm non ſunt illæ, quæ teſtimonium habent traditionis in totâ Eccleſiâ receptæ. *Bellar. Ibid.*

Pag. 60, *&* 61. The Marqueſſe ſaith, that in matters of Faith Chriſt bids us *to obſerve, and doe whatſoever they bid us, Who ſit in* Moſes *Seat, Mat.*23.2,3. whence he infers, *Therefore ſurely there is ſomething more to be obſerved then onely Scripture: Will you not as well believe What you hear Chriſt ſay, as What you hear his Miniſters Write? You hear Chriſt when you hear them, as well as you read Chriſt When you read his Word. He that heareth you heareth me,* Luk.10.16.

Thus the Marqueſſe, but it was from our Saviours meaning, that

that the people ſhould doe ſimply, and abſolutely, whatſoever the Scribes and Phariſees, who ſate in *Moſes* Seat, ſhould enjoyn. Our Saviour meant nothing leſſe, for expreſly he bade beware of *the leaven of the Phariſees, Mat.*16.6. that is, *of the Doctrine of the Phariſees,*v.12. Our Saviours meaning therefore was only this, that whiles the Scribes and Phariſees ſitting in *Moſes* Seat, did deliver the Law and Doctrine of *Moſes*, people ſhould hear and obey, though otherwiſe they were moſt corrupt both in life & Doctrine.

The Jeſuite *Maldonate* doth thus expound the place, as indeed it cannot with any probability be otherwiſe expounded. *When Chriſt* (ſaith he) *bids obſerve, and doe what the Scribes and Phariſees ſay, whiles they ſit in* Moſes *ſeat, he ſpeaks not of their Doctrine, but of the Doctrine of the Law, and of* Moſes. *For it is as if he ſhould ſay, All things, that the Law, and* Moſes *ſhall ſay unto you, the Scribes and Phariſees rehearſing it, obſerve, and do; but after their workes doe not.* Cum jubet ſervare, & facere, quæ Scribæ & Phariſæi, dum in Cathedrâ Moſis ſedent, dicunt, non de ipſorũ, ſed de Legis, ac Moſis doctrinâ loquitur. Perinde enim eſt, acſi dicat, Omnia, quæ Lex, & Moſes vobis dixerint, Scribis & Phariſæis recitantibus, ſervate & facite; ſecundũ autẽ opera, &c. *Mald. ad Mat.*23.23.

It's true, Chriſt doth tells us, that they that hear his Miniſters, hear him, but that is, when they ſpeak as his Miniſters, when they ſpeak his Word, not their owne. As God ſaid to the Prophet *Ezekiel, Thou ſhalt ſpeak my Words unto them, Ezek.* 2.7. And to the Prophet *Jeremy, Speak unto them all that I commaud thee, Jer.* 1.17. And ſo Chriſt to his Apoſtles, *Teaching them to obſerve all things that I have commanded you, Mat.*28.20. So then, we hear Chriſt indeed, when we hear his Word ſpoken by his Miniſters, as well as we read Chriſt, when we read his Word written in the Scriptures. But that which we hear, muſt be tried by that which we read; that which is ſpoken by Miniſters, by that which is written in the Scriptures, as hath been ſhewed before by *Iſai.*8.20. *Joh.*5.39. *Act.*17.11.

We ſay (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *the Scriptures are not eaſie to be underſtood, you ſay they are: We have Scripture for it, as is before manifeſted at large. The Fathers ſay as much, &c.* Pag. 61.

We doe not ſay that the Scriptures throughout in every part of them are eaſie to be underſtood, but that they are ſo in things neceſſary unto Salvation. This hath been ſhewed before by the teſtimony both of the Scripture it ſelf, and of *Auſtine*, as likewiſe that the places of Scripture objected by the Marqueſſe, doe Anſw.

make nothing against the easinesse of the Scripture, either at all, or at least in this sense. Neither are the Fathers, here alledged by the Marquesse, against it.

Bell. de Verbi Dei Interpret. l.3. c. 1. *Iren. l. 2. c.47.* *Irenæus* (whose words the Marquesse produceth not, but *Bellarmine* doth) saith onely that of those things which are contained in the Scriptures, *quædam*, some are such that we must commend unto God, meaning that we cannot perfectly know them. This is nothing repugnant to what we say. Nor that which is

Origen. l.7. contra Cels. apud Bell. ubi supra. said by *Origen* (whom the Marquesse onely citeth at large, *contra Cels.* but I find both the book and the words in *Bellarmine*) *viz.* that the Scripture is *Multis locis obscura*, in many places obscure; of which, what Protestant (I marvell) doth make any question? So when *Ambrose*, *Epist.* 44. calleth the Scripture a Sea, and a depth of propheticall Riddles: And *Hierom*, *Præfat. comment. in Ephes.* saith, that he took great pains to understand the Scripture: And *Austine*, *Epist.* 119. *cap.* 21. saith, that the things of Holy Scripture, which he knew not, were more than those he knew: And *Dionysius*, B. of *Corinth*, (cited by *Eusebius*, *Hist. l.7.c.20*) saith, that the matter of the Scriptures was farre more profound then his Wit could reach; what is all this against Protestants, who onely hold that the Scriptures, in things that concern Faith, and Manners, are not so obscure, but that they ought to be read, or heard by all, and that all may profit by the reading or hearing of them? And in this sense *Bellarmine* yeildeth that *Chrysostome* in diverse places doth affirme the Scriptures to be plain and easie, *viz.* to shake off the laziness of many, who might, if they would, read the Scriptures with much benefit. And besides, we hold, that where the Scripture is obscure, the interpretation of it is to be fetched from the Scripture it self, against which these Fathers say nothing, but both diverse of these, and also diverse others (as hath been shewed) doe plainly avouch it.

Chrysostomus ad excutiendum torporem multorũ, qui possent, si vellent, magno cum fructu Scripturas legere, illis amplificationibus uti solet. *Bell. de verbi Dei Interpret. l 3. c.2.*

Pag. 61. The Marquesse proceeds, saying, *We say that this Church cannot Erre, you say it can: We have Scripture for what we say, such Scripture that will tell you that fools cannot erre therein*, Esay 35. 8. *Such Scripture that will tell you, If you neglect to hear it, you shall be a heathen, and a publican*, Mat. 18. 17. *Such Scripture as will tell*

you,

jon, that this Church ſhall be unto Chriſt a glorious Church, that ſhall be without ſpot or wrinkle, Epheſ.5.27. *Such a Church as ſhall be enlivened for ever with his Spirit,* Eſay 59. 21. *The Fathers affirme the ſame, &c.*

Anſw. Concerning the Churches erring, or not erring, we muſt diſtinguiſh of the Church, and of Errour. The Church is either viſible, which conſiſteth both of good and bad, which therefore is compared to a Net, &c. *Mat.* 13. 47. *&c.* or inviſible, which conſiſteth onely of the Elect, and true Beleevers, *The Lord knoweth who are his,* 2 *Tim.*2.19. Men may know who profeſſe themſelves to be his, but who are indeed, only God knoweth. *All the Elect, they are the Church,* ſaith *Bernard.* And to the ſame effect *Auſtine, The Church conſiſteth of thoſe that are good, who build upon the Rock, not of thoſe that build upon the Sand.* As for Errour, it is either damnable, or not damnable. Now it is granted, that the inviſible Church cannot erre damnably. For this is that Church which Chriſt ſpeaketh of, and ſaith, That *the gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it, Mat.* 16. 18. But for the Church Viſible, whether our Adverſaries mean the Church Virtuall, whereby they underſtand the Pope, or the Church Repreſentative, that is, a Generall Councell, we hold that it may Erre, and that damnably. The Scriptures alledged are not againſt this aſſertion. That *Eſai.*35.8. ſpeaks not of the Church, but of a Way, called there, *The Way of Holineſſe*; ſo ſure and ſafe, that *Wayfaring men, though fooles, ſhall not Erre therein.* That *Mat.*18.17. onely ſhewes that a member of the Church, being juſtly admoniſhed by the Church, ought to ſubmit to the Admonition of it, or elſe is to be accounted as a Publican or Heathen. But this is farre from proving the Churches infallibility. That *Epheſ.*5.27. ſhewes, not what the Church is here in this world, but what it ſhall be hereafter in the world to come; * *It is not ſo to be underſtood* (ſaith *Auſtine*) *as if the Church were now ſo, but that it is prepared that it may be ſo.* And accordingly † *Bede, In the*

Electi omnes, ipſi Eccleſia ſunt. *Bern. in Cant. Serm.* 78.

In bonis eſt eccleſia, in his, qui ædificant ſuper petram, non in his, qui ædificant ſuper arenam. *Aug. de Unit. Eccleſ.*

* Non eſt ita intelligendum quaſi Eccleſia ita jam ſit, ſed quia præparatur ut ſit. *Aug. in Retract.*

† In regno cœlorum Eccleſia plenè & perfectè erit non habens maculam, aut rugam, &c. Cum enim non tantùm dixit, ut exhiberet tibi eccleſiam non habentem maculam aut rugam, ſed addidit, glorioſam, ſatis ſignificavit, quando erit ſine maculâ & rugâ. *Beda ad loc.*

Kingdome of Heaven the Church ſhall be fully and perfectly without ſpot or wrinkle, &c. For when as the Apoſtle did not only ſay that he might preſent it to himſelf, a Church not having ſpot or wrinkle, but alſo added Glorious; he ſufficiently ſignified when it ſhall be without Spot or Wrinkle. That *Eſai.* 59. 21. ſheweth that God will give both his Word and his Spirit for ever unto his Church, but it ſpeaks of the inviſible Church, the Elect and Godly, *Such as turn from Tranſgreſſion*, ver. 20. not of any outward viſible Church, which hath no ſuch priviledge, but that it may Erre, and ſo Erre as to ceaſe to be a Church, as the example of the Churches of *Aſia*, mentioned *Revel.* 2. & 3. doth make manifeſt.

For the Fathers, the firſt, whom the Marqueſſe citeth is *Auſtine*, whom (as before is ſhewed) holdeth Generall Councells lyable to Errour, and ſuch, as that the former may be corrected by the latter. That therefore which he ſaith, * *Contra Creſcon. l.* 1. *c.* 33. (ſo, I preſume it ſhould be, not *cap.* 3. as it is in the Marqueſſe his Paper) *viz.* That *We hold the truth of the Scriptures, when we doe that, which hath pleaſed the whole Church, which the authority of the ſame Scriptures doth commend:* That (I ſay) muſt be underſtood, ſo farre forth as the Scriptures doe commend the Church, we do well, and conformably to the Scriptures, in conforming to it. But I ſee not how *Auſtine* himſelf could hold the Church to be ſo commended in the Scriptures, as that we muſt ſimply and abſolutely doe what the Church pleaſeth. For then, what need of having one Generall Councell to be corrected and amended by another? Our Adverſaries themſelves, when they pleaſe, make no ſcruple of waving and altering that which was generally held and practiced in the Church. *I let paſſe* (ſaith *Maldonate*) *the opinion of* Auſtine, *and of* Innocentius, *which about* 600. *yeares did prevaile in the Church, that the Euchariſt is neceſſary even for Infants. The thing is now declared by the Church, both by the Cuſtome of many Ages, and alſo by the decree of the Councell of* Trent, *that it is not onely not neceſſary for them, but alſo that it is not meet to be given unto them. Cyprian, Epiſt.* 55. (who is the next that the Marqueſſe citeth) ſpeaketh indeed of the Authority of the Church

* That place is objected by *Bellarmine* to prove that the Church cannot Erre.

Miſſam facio Auguſtini & Innocentii ſententiam, quæ 600. circiter annos viguit in Eccleſiâ, Euchariſtiam etiam infantibus eſſe neceſſariam. Res jam ab Eccleſiâ, & multorum ſeculorum uſu, & decreto concilii Tridentini explicata eſt, non ſolùm non neceſſariam illis eſſe, ſed ne decere quidem dari. *Maldon. ad Joh.* 6. 53.

Church, but how? ſo as to cenſure and excommunicate thoſe that deſerve it, about that hee writes unto *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*. But this is much ſhort of proving the Church to be infallible, and that it cannot erre.

Cyprian was far from aſcribing ſo much to the Church, when (as 'tis well known) contrary to what the Biſhop of *Rome*, and the Church generally did hold, he held the re-baptizing of ſuch as had been baptized by Heretikes. Though *Cyprian* in this did erre, yet his very erring in this, ſhewes that hee thought the Church, the generality of the viſible Church, not onely ſubject to error, but indeed to have erred.

The laſt Father, whom the Marqueſſe here mentioneth (for though hee ſay *cum multis aliis*, yet hee nameth no more) is * *Irenæus l.3.c.4.* where he ſaith, *It is not meet to ſeeke the truth among others, which it is eaſie to take of the Church, ſeeing the Apoſtles did lay in it, as in a rich depoſitory, all things that concerne truth, that every one that will, may out of it receive the drinke of life.*

* Non oportet adhuc quærere apud alios veritatem, quam facile eſt ab Eccleſiâ ſumere, cum Apoſtoli quaſi in depoſitorium dives, pleniſſimè in eâ contulerint omnia, quæ ſint veritatis, uti omnis quicunque velit, ſumat ex eâ potum vitæ. *Iren. lib. 3. cap. 4.*

This indeed is glorioufly ſpoken of the Church, and not Hyperbolically neither; yet doth it not amount to this, that the Church cannot erre. The holy Scriptures, wherein all ſaving truth is contained, are committed to the Church, and the Doctine of ſalvation is ordinarily held forth in, and by the Church; but hence it doth not follow, that the Church, that is, ſuch as beare ſway in it, is not ſubject to error. All that *Irenæus* ſaith of the Church is no more, if ſo much as that of the Apoſtle, 1 *Tim.3.15.* that *the Church is the pillar and ground of truth*; which place it may ſeeme ſtrange that the Marqueſſe pretermitteth. *Bellarmine* diſputing this point, brings in thoſe words in the very firſt place, to prove that the Church cannot erre. And whereas *Calvin* anſwers, that the Church is ſo ſtyled by the Apoſtle, becauſe in it the Scriptures are preſerved and preached, he replies, that thus the Church ſhould rather be compared to a Cheſt, then to a Pillar. But this is a frivolous objection; for the Church doth not keepe the truth cloſe and ſecret, as a thing is kept in a cheſt; but ſo as to profeſſe and publiſh

Bell. de Eccleſ. mili. 4. li. 3. cap.4.

liſh it, and therefore is compared to a Pillar, to which a thing is faſtned, and ſo hangeth, that all may ſee it. But that thoſe words of the Apoſtle do not infer an infallibility of the Church, and an exemption from errour, is cleare by this, that he ſpeakes of a particular viſible Church, namely the Church of *Epheſus*; now that a particular viſible Church may erre, our Adverſaries will not deny, and that very Church of *Epheſus* there ſpoken of doth ſufficiently demonſtrate. The Apoſtle therefore in thoſe words doth rather ſhew the duty of the Church then the dignity of it; rather what it ſhould be, then what it alwayes is. As when it is ſaid *Mal.*2.7. *Labia ſacerdotis cuſtodient ſcientiam, The Prieſts lips ſhall keep knowledge*, that is (as our tranſlations rightly render it) *ſhould keepe*. So the Jeſuite *Ribera* doth expound it, *ſhall keepe*, that is (ſaith he) ought to keep.

Cuſtodient, id eſt, cuſtodire debent. *Rib. ad Mal.*2.

The Marqueſſe here comes againe to the viſibility of the Church, and ſome other particulars before handled. That the Church is alwayes viſible, he proves by *Mat.*5.14,15. *The light of the World*; *a City upon a Hill cannot be hid.* But I have ſhewed before theſe words, *Yee are the light of the world*, to be meant of the Apoſtles, who (as their own *Janſenius* expounds it) were a light unto the World by their preaching. So alſo * *Theophylact*, *They did not enlighten* (ſaith hee) *one Nation, but the whole world.* And the words following, *A City ſet upon a Hill cannot be hid*, he ſhewes to have been ſpoken by way of inſtruction. *Chriſt* (ſaith hee) *doth inſtruct them to be carefull and accurate in the ordering of their life, as being to be ſeene of all. As if hee ſhould ſay, Doe not thinke, that you ſhall lie hid in a corner; no, you ſhall be conſpicuous. And therefore ſee that yee live unblameably, that ſo you may not give offence to others.* This expoſition ſutes well with the admonition given *verſ.* 16. *Let your light ſo ſhine forth before men, that they ſeeing your good workes may glorifie your Father which is in Heaven.*

* Οὐκ ἔθνος δὲ ἓν ἐφώτισαν ἕτοι, ἀλλὰ τὸν κόσμον. *Theophyl. ad. loc.*

Παιδεύει αὐτὰς ἐναγωνίως εἶναι, καὶ ἀκριβῶς περὶ τὸν βίον, ὡς πρὸ πάντων βλεπομένων μέλλοντας. μὴ γὰρ νομίσητε, φησὶ, ὅτι ἐν γωνίᾳ κρυβήσεσθε; ἀλλὰ περίβλεπτοι ἔσεσθε. ὥστε βλέπετε πῶς ἀμώμως ζήσεσθε, ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἑτέρους σκανδαλίζητε. *Theophyl. ibid.*

The Marqueſſe here further addes, 2 *Cor.*4.3. & *Iſai.* 22. I ſuppoſe it ſhould be, *Iſai.* 2.2. Now the former of theſe two places

places is not to the purpoſe, *viz.* to prove a perpetuall viſibility of the Church. For how can that be inferred from thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *If our Goſpell be hid, it is hid to them that are loſt ?* The Apoſtle having ſaid *verſ.* 2. *by manifeſtation of the truth commending our ſelves to every mans conſcience in the ſight of God,* becauſe (as * *Oecumenius* notes) it might be objected, that the truth was not made manifeſt unto all, for that all did not believe, to prevent this Objection the Apoſtle addes, *If our Goſpell be hid, &c.* As if hee ſhould ſay, It is not our fault, as if the Goſpell were not plainly enough preached by us, but it is their own fault, who periſh through their owne blindneſſe. That *Iſai.* 2. 2. is more to the purpoſe though not enough neither. It is ſaid that *in the laſt dayes the Mountaine of the Lords Houſe ſhall be eſtabliſhed in the top of the Mountaines, and ſhall be exalted above the Hills, and all Nations ſhall flow unto it.* The Prophet there ſheweth, (by metaphoricall expreſſions taken from Mount *Sion*, where the Temple ſtood) that by the preaching of the Goſpell, the Church ſhould be increaſed and exalted farre above what it was before. This propheſie was fulfilled by the bringing in of the Gentiles: but the Prophet doth not ſay, that in the times of the Goſpell the Church ſhould alwayes be ſo conſpicuous and viſible. Neither doe the Fathers here alledged by the Marqueſſe, *viz. Origen, Chryſoſtome. Auſtine* and *Cyprian*, ſpeake of the perpetuall condition of the Church, but onely as it was in their time. I have proved before by Scriptures, and Fathers, and even by the acknowledgement of our Adverſaries, that the Church is not perpetually viſible.

* Ἐπειδὴ εἶπε, πρὸς πᾶσαν συνείδησιν ἀνθρώπων συνίστων ἑαυτὸς διὰ τῆς ἀληθοῦς φανερώσεως, τελέσι τῷ κηρύγματι &, ἀντέκειτο δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ μὴ πᾶσιν εἶναι φανερὸν τὸ κήρυγμα (καὶ δῆλον ἐξ ὧν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν) φησὶν, οὐχ ἡμῶν τὸ ἔγκλημα, ἢ τῆς ἀσαφείας τῶ εὐαγγελίε, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἐκείνων ἀπωλείας καὶ ὀφλήσεως. *Oecumen. ad.* 2. *Cor.* 4. 3.

After the Viſibility of the Church, the Marqueſſe ſpeaketh of the Univerſality of it, ſaying that the univerſality of the Church is perpetuall, and that the Church of *Rome* is ſuch a Church. For proofe hereof hee citeth, *Pſal.* 2. 8. *Rom.* 1. 8. Now the former place ſhewes that Chriſt ſhould have the heathen for his inheritance, and the ends of the Earth for his poſſeſſion; and conſequently that the Church ſhould not be confined (as it was *Page* 62.

in the time of the Law) to one Country, but ſhould be extended farre and wide throughout the World. This alſo hath been fulfilled, and yet ſhall be: but hence it doth not follow, that the Church is alwayes ſo univerſally extended throughout the World, but that ſometimes errors and hereſies doe ſo prevaile and overſpread all, that the truth in compariſon can finde no roome. See before *page* 2. The other place, *viz. Rom.* 1.8. teſtifies indeed that the Church of *Rome* was a true Church, and famous throughout the World: but neither doth the Apoſtle there ſay, neither (ſo farre as I ſee) can it in any congruity be ſaid, that the Church of *Rome* either is, or was a Church univerſally ſpread thorough the World. A part, and an eminent part of the Church ſo univerſall it might be, but the whole univerſall Church it could not be. The Apoſtle there ſaith no more of the *Romanes*, then he doth of the *Theſſalonians*, 1 *Theſſ.* 1.8. yet (I preſume) our Adverſaries will not therefore admit either the Church of *Theſſalonica* to be univerſall, or ever ſince the Apoſtles time to have continued ſound and Orthodox. And why then will they thinke to inforce ſo much from the Apoſtles words for the Church of *Rome*? To theſe two places of Scripture the Marqueſſe addeth the teſtimonies of three Fathers, *viz. Cyprian*, *Auſtine*, and *Hierome*. But for the firſt of theſe, his words are pitifully miſtaken. They are theſe, *Dum apud vos unus animus, & una vox eſt, Eccleſia omnis Romana confeſſa eſt*; the Marqueſſe renders it thus, *whilſt with you there is one minde, and one voyce, the whole Church is confeſſed to be the Roman Church*: whereas any that can underſtand Latine, and wil minde the words, may ſee that they are to be rendred thus, *whileſt with you there is one minde, and one voyce, the whole Roman Church hath confeſſed*. *Cyprian* here wrote to *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome*, who together with others had before heathen perſecutors confeſſed the faith. For this *Cyprian* commends them, and ſaith that they ſo confeſſing as they did, and all being of one minde, and one voyce, the whole Roman Church did confeſſe. This makes indeed for the ſoundneſſe of the Roman Church, as it was in *Cyprians* time, but for the univerſality of it, as if it were the univerſall Church, or a Church univerſally diffuſed, it makes nothing. For *Auſtines* words *de unit. Eccleſ.* cap. 4. *Who*

Cyprian. ad Cornel. Epiſt. 57.

ſo

ſo doth not communicate with the whole corps of Chriſtendome, certaine it is, that they are not in the holy Catholick Church, I ſee not what they are to the purpoſe. They cannot be ſo underſtood, as that all muſt neceſſarily communicate with all that are of the corps of Chriſtendome, that is, that profeſſe themſelves Chriſtians. For ſo all ſhould be tied to communion with groſſe and notorious Heretikes. They muſt then be underſtood of communicating with all Chriſtians ſo farre forth as they are indeed Chriſtians: but what is this to prove either the perpetuall univerſality of the Church, or that the Church of *Rome* is ſuch a Church? *Auſtine* wrote againſt the Donatiſts, who confined the Church to Affrike, excluding all the World beſides from being of the Church. This is nothing againſt us, who doe not confine the Church to any place whatſoever.

The laſt Father here cited is *Hierom*, who (as the Marqueſſe telleth us) ſaith, *That it is all one to ſay the Roman Faith, and the Catholike Faith.* But the Marqueſſes quotation of the place where this is to be found in *Hierome*, is too laxe, *viz. in Apol. ad Ruffin.* it ſhould be *adverſus Ruffin.* But there are two Apologies which *Hierome* wrote againſt *Ruffin*, and one of them divided into ſeverall Bookes; it was meet therefore that the place ſhould have been cited more particularly then it is. Yet I think I have met with the place which the Marqueſſe meaneth, which yet doth not ſpeake ſo much as the Marqueſſe ſuppoſeth.

* *Ruffinus* tranſlating *Origens* workes (which had many groſſe errors in them) into Latine, to juſtifie himſelfe ſaid, *the Latine Reader ſhall finde nothing, that differs from our faith.*

Hereupon *Hierome* asked, what faith he meant by *our faith?* whether that faith, which did flouriſh in the Church of *Rome*, or that, which was contained in the workes of *Origen? If* (ſaith hee) *he ſhall anſwer, The Roman faith then are we Catholickes, who have tranſlated nothing of Origens error: but if Origens blaſphemy be his faith, whileſt he chargeth me with inconſtancy he proves himſelfe an Heretick.* Here indeed *Hierome* implieth the Roman

* Nihil, inquit, in illis, quod à fide noſtrâ diſcrepet, Latinus Lector inveniet. Fidem ſuam quam vocat? eámne, quâ Romana pollet Eccleſia? an illam, quæ in Origenis voluminibus continetur? Si Romanam reſponderit, ergò Catholici ſumus, qui nihil de Origenis errore tranſtulimus: ſin autem Origenis blaſphemia fides illius eſt, dum mihi inconſtantiæ crimen impingit, ſe hæreticum probat. *Hieron. apol. 1. adverſ. Ruffin. lib. 1. cap. 1.*

faith, and the Catholick faith, to have been then when he wrote one and the ſame, yet not ſimply, but ſo farre forth as did concerne the errors of *Origen*. But how can any juſtly hence conclude, that in *Hieromes* Dialect *it's all one to ſay the Roman faith, and the Catholick faith* ? as if in *Hieromes* opinion the Roman faith, and the Catholick faith, in all points, and at all times muſt needs be the ſame.

That *Hierome* did not overvalue the Church of *Rome* is evident. For when the cuſtome of that Church was objected againſt ſomething that hee held, hee rejected the authority of it with ſome diſdaine, ſaying, *If wee ſeek authority, the World is greater then the City*. And againe, *what doe you bringing the cuſtome of one City* ?

Si authoritas quæritur, orbis major eſt urbe.——Quid mihi profers unius conſuetudinem ? *Hieron. ad Euagr.*

Page 62. From Univerſality, the Marqueſſe paſſeth to Unity, ſaying that the unity of the Church is neceſſary in all points of faith, and proving it firſt by Scriptures, as *Epheſ.*4.5. *Acts* 4.35. and 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. then by fathers, as *Auſtine contra Par.l.*3.*c.*5. *Cypr. de unit. Eccleſ.* and *Hilar. ad Conſtant.* Now this unity of the Church hath been ſpoken of before, and it hath beene ſhewed how far it is requiſite, as alſo how little cauſe they of the Church of *Rome* have either to applaud themſelves for it, or to upbraide the Reformed Churches for want of it. *There is one Lord, one faith, one baptiſme*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Eph.*4. 5. well, ſuppoſe they of the Roman-church have one faith, yet except they have the one faith, this, of which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, what are they the better ? But indeed neither is their faith ſo one, as they pretend, there being many great and weighty points, wherein they differ one from another. See *Gerard loc. com. de Eccleſ. Sect.*240 &c.

On the other ſide (as I have ſaid before) if the confeſſions of the reformed churches be look't upon rather then particular mens opinions, or perhaps expreſſions, there will no great difference in points of faith be found amongſt them. *Acts* 4.35. here cited by the Marqueſſe, is not to the purpoſe, as not ſpeakking of unity of faith, but rather of affection, 1 *Cor.*1.10. the Apoſtle exhorts them to unity, and that there might be no diviſions among them ; but becauſe there was not ſuch unity, as

was

was meet, but there were divisions among them, he doth not therefore say, that they were no true Church: In a word both the Scriptures and the Fathers are for the unity of the Church in points of Faith, and so are we; that the severall Articles of Protestant Churches deny this Unity, the Marquesse affirmeth, but doth not prove it.

We hold (saith the Marquesse) *that every Minister of the Church, especially the supreme Minister, or Head thereof, should be in a capacity of fungifying his Office in Preaching the Gospell, Administring the Sacrament, Baptizing, Marrying, and not otherwise. This we have Scripture for*, Heb. No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as Aaron was. *This you deny; and not onely so, but you so deny it, as that your Church hath maintained and practiced it a long time, for a woman to be head, or supreme Moderatrix in the Church; When you know that according to the Word of God (in this respect) a woman is not onely forbidden to be the head of the man, but to have a tongue in her head*, 1 Tim. 2. 11. 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. *Yet so hath this been denyed by you, that many have beene hang'd, drawn and quarter'd for not acknowledging it. The Fathers are of our opinion, &c.* *Pag.* 62, & 63.

Answ. All this is but to strike at the Title which hath beene given to our Kings and Queens, *viz.* Supreme Heads, or Governours, and Governesses of the Church within their Dominions. We know our Adversaries have much stomack'd, and opposed this Title, but we know no just cause that they have had for it. We never made Kings or Queens Ministers of the Church, so as to dispense the Word, and Sacraments, only we have attributed unto them this Power, to look to, and have a care of the Church, that the Word be Preached, and the Sacraments Administred by fit persons, and in a right manner. This is no more then belongs unto Kings and Queens, as both Scriptures and Fathers doe informe us. We see in the Scriptures, that the good Kings of *Judah*, as *Asia*, *Jehoshaphat*, *Hezekiah* and *Josiah*, (not to speak of *David* and *Solomon*, who were Prophets as well as Kings, and so may be excepted against as extraordinary persons) did put forth their power in ordering the Affaires of the Church, as well as of the Civill State. *Asa* put down Idolatry, and caused the People to enter into Covenant to serve the Lord, 2 *Chron.* 15. *Jehoshaphat* took

away the High Places, and the Groves, and made the Priests and Levites to goe and teach the People, 2 *Chron.* 17. *Hezekiah* reformed what had been amisse in matter of Gods Worship, caused the Priests and Levites to do their Duty, and the Passeover to be solemnly kept, 2 *Chron.* 29. & 30, & 31. So *Josiah* also destroyed Idolatry, repaired the Temple, and kept a most solemne Passeover, causing both Priests and People to performe their Duty.

In hoc reges, sicut eis divinitus præcipitur, Deo serviunt, in quantum reges sunt, si in suo regno, bona jubeant, mala prohibeant, non solùm quæ pertinent ad humanam societatem, verumetiam quæ ad divinam religionem. *Aug. contra Cresc. lib. 3. cap. 51.*

Austine acknowledgeth this power to belong unto Kings. *In this* (saith he) *Kings, as they are commanded of God, doe serve God as Kings, if in their Kingdome they command good things, and forbid evill things, not only which belong unto humane Society, but also which concerne Divine Religion.* And the same Father speaking of Christian Princes, makes their happines to lie in this, *That they make their power serviceable to Gods majesty, in enlarging his worship, as much as they are able.*

Si suam potestatem ad Dei cultum maximè dilatandum, majestati ejus famulam faciunt. *Aug. de Civil Dei. 5. c. 24.*

This power also Christian Princes have exercised, and have not been taxed for it, as *Constantine, Theodosius, &c.* See *Mason de Minist. Anglic. lib. 3. cap. 4.* The exercising therefore of this power which we ascribe to Kings and Queenes, is no taking that Honour to themselves, which is spoken of *Heb.* 5. 4. Neither is it any teaching, or speaking in the Church, which the Apostle will not allow unto a woman, 1 *Tim.* 2. 11, 12. and 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. Neither is this crosse to what the Fathers, whom the Marquesse citeth, say, which amounts to this, that Ministers are to doe those things which belong unto Ministers, and that in those things which concern their Ministery, all, even Kings and Queens, are subject unto them. All this is nothing against Kings and Queens having a power over Ministers, so as to see them perform the Offices which belong unto them. And it may seeme strange that the Marquesse should now so lately with so much eagernesse inveigh against that Title, and Power, given to that Queen of happy memory, Q. *Elizabeth*, as most unmeet for her, when as *Hart*, a Papist, stiffe enough, living in the Queens time, by his Conference with Doctor *Rainolds*, and Doctor *Nowels* Book against *Dorman*, was so convinced, that he confessed himself satisfied in this

* See Doctor *Rainolds* his Conference with *Hart* in the end.

this point, and acknowledged that we aſcribe no more unto Princes, then *Auſtine* doth in the words before cited.

We ſay, that Chriſt gave commiſſion to his Diſciples to forgive Sinnes; you deny it, and ſay, that God onely can forgive ſins, We have Scripture for it, Joh. 20. 23. Whoſeſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted: and whoſeſoever ſins ye retain, they are retained. *And* Joh. 20. 21. As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you. *And how was that?* viz. *With ſo great power as to forgive ſins,* Mat. 9. 3. 8. *Where note, that S.* Matthew *doth not ſet downe, how that the people glorified God the Father, who had given ſo great power unto God the Son; but that he had given* ſo great power unto men, *loc. cit. The Fathers are of this opinion, &c.* Pag. 63.

It is ſtrange that the Marqueſſe ſhould ſay, that we deny that Chriſt gave Commiſſion to his Diſciples to forgive Sinnes: We confeſſe that the Scripture is clear for it, that he did give them ſuch a Commiſſion; onely the queſtion is, how the Commiſſion is to be underſtood, and what power it is that the Diſciples had, and ſo other Miniſters have to forgive Sinnes? It's true, we hold that God only can forgive ſins, and yet withall, that men may forgive ſins. Theſe are not contradictory, the one to the other, becauſe (as all Logitians know) except the propoſitions be underſtood of one and the ſame thing, in one and the ſame reſpect; there is no contradiction. Now when we ſay, that onely God can forgive ſins, it is meant in one reſpect; and when we ſay, that men may forgive ſinnes, it is meant in another reſpect. As the ſin is againſt God, ſo properly and authoritatively God alone can forgive it. And this God doth challenge unto himſelf as his prerogative, *I, even I am he, that blotteth out thy tranſgreſſions, &c. Iſai.* 43. 25. And therefore the Scribes were right in this, *Who can forgive ſins, but God onely? Mar.* 2. 7. They were right in the Doctrine, though wrong in the Application: their poſition was good, that God only can forgive Sins; but their ſuppoſition was naught, that Chriſt was but a meer Man, and had not power to forgive Sins, as he did. *This* (ſaith **Hilary*) *troubles the Scribes, that a man doth forgive ſin; for they took Chriſt for a meer Man.——It is true, none can forgive ſinne but God only: and therefore he that forgiveth, is* Anſw.

* Movet Scribas remiſſũ ab homine peccatum: hominẽ enim tantum in Jeſu Chriſto contuebantur.——Verum enim, nemo poteſt dimittere peccata, niſi ſolus Deus: Ergo qui remittit Deus eſt, quia nemo remittit niſi Deus. *Hilar. in Mat. Can.* 8.

God,

God, becauſe none forgiveth but God. The ſame alſo is clearly and fully acknowledged by *Gregory*, whom amongſt other Fathers the Marqueſſe alledgeth againſt us. He writing upon the ſecond Penitentiall Pſalme, that is, the 32. Pſalme, upon thoſe words, *Thou forgaveſt the iniquity of my ſin*, he ſaith thus, *Thou, Who alone ſpareſt, Who alone doeſt forgive ſinnes. For who can forgive ſinnes, but God onely?* And with theſe agreeth *Irenæus*, whom alſo the Marqueſſe bringeth in as a witneſſe on his ſide. He ſpeaking of Chriſts forgiving of ſinnes, ſaith, *That thereby he did declare who he was: For if none can forgive ſinnes but onely God, and the Lord (Chriſt) did forgive them, then it is manifeſt, that he was the Word of God, made the Son of Man, &c. and that as God he hath mercy on us, and doth forgive us our debts, which we owe unto God our Maker.* Accordingly alſo *Ambroſe*, (another of thoſe Fathers, whom the Marqueſſe maketh to be of their opinion) *Whereas* (ſaith he) *Jewes ſay that onely God can forgive ſinnes, they doe indeed confeſſe Chriſt to be God, and by their judgement bewray their perfidiouſneſſe, &c. They have a teſtimony for Chriſts Divinity, they have no Faith for their owne Salvation: Therefore great is the madneſſe of the unbelieving people, that when as they confeſſe that it belongs onely unto God to forgive ſinnes, yet they doe not beleeve God, when he forgiveth ſins.* So by this Argument the ſame Father proves the Holy Ghoſt to be God, becauſe he forgiveth Sins. For that none can forgive ſinnes but onely God, as it is written, *Who can forgive ſinnes, but only God?* Thus *Ambroſe* cites that ſaying of the Scribes as a moſt undoubted truth. How then have Miniſters power to forgive Sins? In that *the Word of reconciliation is committed*

Tu qui ſolus pareis, qui ſolus peccata dimittis. Quis enim poteſt peccata dimittere, niſi ſolus Deus? *Greg. in 2 pœnitent. Pſal.*

Peccata igitur remittens, hominem quidem curavit, ſemetipſum autem manifeſtè oſtendit quis eſſet. Si enim nemo poteſt remittere peccata niſi ſolus Deus, remittebat autem hæc Dominus, & curabat homines, manifeſtum eſt, quòd ipſe erat Verbum Dei, filius hominis factus, &c. tanquam Deus miſereatur noſtri, & remittat nobis debita noſtra, quæ factori noſtro debemus Deo. *Ircu. lib. 5. pag. 583. edict. in 8°.*

Quæ cum Judæi aſſerunt à ſolo Deo poſſe concedi, Deũ utique confitentur, ſuóque judicio perfidiam ſuam produnt, &c. Itaque teſtimonium non deeſt divinitati, fides deeſt ſaluti.—— Magna itaque infidæ plebis amentia, ut cum confeſſa fuerit ſolius Dei eſſe donare peccata, non credat peccata donanti. *Ambroſ. in Luc. 5.*

Deus enim ex eo cognoſcitur, &c. quia peccata condonat.——Peccata nemo condonat, niſi unus Deus; quia ſcriptum eſt, Quis poteſt peccata donare, niſi ſolus Deus? *Ambroſ. de Spiritu Sancto lib. 3. cap. 19.*

To this purpoſe likewiſe is *Auſtine*, (another of the Marqueſſes Fathers) cited by *Lombard, lib. 4. diſt. 18. lit. c.*

committed unto them, 2 *Cor.* 5.19. in that they are *to preach remiſſion of ſinnes in Chriſts name*, Luk. 24.47. *Be it known unto you, that through this man* (viz. Chriſt) *is preached unto you forgiveneſſe of ſinnes*, ſaid *Paul*, Act. 13. 38. *Ambroſe* obſerves, that Chriſt firſt ſaid to his Apoſtles, *Receive ye the holy Ghoſt*, and then, *Whoſe ſins ye remit, they are remitted.* Whence he gathers, that it is the holy Ghoſt that doth indeed forgive Sins. *Men* (ſaith he) *doe onely afford their Miniſtery for the forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, they doe not exerciſe the authority of any power. Neither doe they forgive ſins in their Name, but in the Name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghoſt. Lombard*, called the Maſter of the Sentences, and of School-divinity, diſputing this Queſtion, and ſhewing diverſe Opinions about it, determines thus, *That God only doth remit, and retain ſins, and that yet God hath given power to the Church to bind and looſe. But that God himſelf doth bind and looſe one way, and the Church another way. That God by himſelf alone doth forgive ſinne, ſo as to clenſe the ſoul from ſtaine, and to free it from the guilt of eternall death. That he hath not given this power to Prieſts, to whom yet he hath given power to looſe and bind, that is, to declare men to be looſed, or bound. Whence our Lord firſt by himſelfe made the Leper ſound, and then ſent him to the Prieſts, that they might declare him to be clean.* And hence he inferres, that a Miniſter of the Goſpell hath ſuch power in remitting or retaining ſins, as the Prieſt in the Law had in clenſing a Leper. The Prieſt was ſaid to make the Leper clean, or unclean, (ſo the words are in the Originall, *Levit.* 13.) when he

Nunc videamus utrum peccata donet Spiritus. Sed hinc dubitari non poteſt, cum ipſe Dominus dixerit, Accipite Spiritum S. quorum remiſeritis peccata, remiſſa erunt. Ecce quia per Spiritum S. peccata donantur. Homines autem in remiſſionem peccatorum miniſteriũ ſuum exhibent, non jus alicujus poteſtatis exercent. Neque enim in ſuo, ſed in Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus S. nomine peccata dimittuntur. *Ambr. de Spir. S. lib. 3. cap. 19.*

Ecce quàm varia à doctoribus traduntur ſuper his, & in hàc tantâ varietate quid erit tenendum? Hoc ſanè dicere ac ſentire poſſumus, quòd ſolus Deus dimittit peccata, & retinet; & tamen eccleſiæ contulit poteſtatem ligandi, & ſolvendi. Sed aliter ipſe ſolvit, & ligat, aliter eccleſia. Ipſe enim per ſe tantùm ita dimittit peccatum, quòd & animam mundat ab interiori maculâ, & à debito æternæ mortis ſolvit. Non autem hoc ſacerdotibus conceſſit, quibus tamen tribuit poteſtatem ſolvendi, & ligandi, i. oſtendendi homines ligatos vel ſolutos. Unde Dominus leproſum ſanitati priùs per ſe reſtituit; deinde ad ſacerdotes miſit, quorum judicio oſtenderetur mundatus. *Lombard. lib. 4. diſt. 18. lit. d. & e.*

In ſolvendis ergò culpis, vel retinendis ita operatur ſacerdos Evangelicus, ſicut olim legalis in illis, qui contaminati erant Leprâ, quæ peccatum ſignat. —— Et in remittendis, vel in retinendis culpis id juris atque officii habent Eccleſiaſtici ſacerdotes, quod olim habebant ſub lege legales in curandis leproſis. Hi ergò peccata dimittunt, vel retinent, dum dimiſſa à Deo, vel retenta judicant & oſtendunt. *Lomb. Ibid.*

did pronounce and declare him to be clean or unclean. So *Miniſters remit, or retain ſinnes, when they pronounce and declare that ſins are remitted, or retained of God.* And in this *Lombard* followed *Hierome*, who (as his words cited by *Lombard* doe ſhew) by this very ſimilitude of the Leviticall Prieſt, dealing with a Leper, illuſtrates and ſets forth the manner how a Miniſter doth now remit, or retain ſins. Thus then I hope it may ſufficiently appear, that in this point both Scriptures and Fathers are for us, and not againſt us, as the Marqueſſe would have it.

Marq: pag. 63. & 64. *We hold, that we ought to confeſſe our ſins unto our ghoſtly Father; this ye deny, ſaying, that ye ought not to confeſſe your ſins but unto God alone. This we prove by Scripture*, Mat. 3.5,6. Then went out Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confeſſing their ſinnes. *This confeſſion was no generall confeſſion, but in particular, as appeares*, Acts 19. 18, 19. And many that beleeved, came and confeſſed, and ſhewed their deeds. *The Fathers affirme the ſame, &c.*

Anſw. For Confeſſion of Sinnes, Proteſtants doe not ſay, that they ought not to confeſſe to any but God onely, though they hold that ordinarily it ſufficeth to confeſſe onely unto God, and that there is no neceſſity of confeſſing to any other; whereas they of the Church of *Rome* will have it neceſſary for every one man to *confeſſe* unto a Prieſt all his deadly ſinnes, (and ſuch indeed are all ſinnes whatſoever without the mercy of God in Chriſt, *Rom.* 6.23. *Gal.* 3.10.) which by diligent examination he can find out, together with all the ſeverall circumſtances, whereby they are aggravated. Thus hath the Councell of *Trent* decreed it. And nothing will ſuffice to procure one, that is Baptized, remiſſion of Sins, without this Confeſſion either *in Re*, actually performed, or *in Voto*, in deſire, as *Bellarmine* doth expound it. Who alſo ſtickes not to ſay, that in all the Scripture there ſeems not to be any promiſe of forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, made to thoſe that confeſſe their ſins unto God. Which is a mo[st] impudent Aſſertion. For *David* having ſaid, *I acknowledged my ſinne unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid: I ſaid I will confeſſe my tranſgreſſions unto the Lord, and thou forgaveſt the iniquity of my ſinne:* he addes immediately,

Concil. Trident. Seſſ. 14 cap. 5. Et can. 6, 7, 8. Bell. de Pœnit. l. 3. c. 20.

Promiſſio de remittendis peccatis, iis qui confitentur Deo peccata ſua, non videtur ulla extare in divinis literis. *Bell. de pœnit. lib. 3. cap. 4. Sect. At Solutio.*

For

for this ſhall every one that is godly make his prayer unto thee, &c. Pſal. 32. 5, 6. Beſides * *Aquinas* and *Bonaventure*, two prime Schoolemen, hold that under the Law it was not (ordinarily) required of people to confeſſe in particular unto a Prieſt. *Bonaventure* alſo cites *Auſtine*, ſaying, *Oblatio ſacrificiorum fuit confeſſio peccatorum*, The offering of ſacrifices, was the confeſſion of ſinnes; whence hee inferreth, that therefore it ſeemes there was no other confeſſing of ſinnes, but the offering of Sacrifices.

* *Aquin. in ſuppl. quæſt. 6. art. 2 ad. 3. Bonav. lib. 4. diſt. 17. art. 1. qu. 2.* Ergò videtur quòd non fuerit ibi alia confeſſio, quàm oblatio. *Bonav. ibid.*

For thoſe two places of Scripture cited by the Marqueſſe, neither they, nor any other doe ſpeake of ſuch a confeſſion as they of the Church of *Rome* doe contend for. *Bellarmine* holds that their Sacramentall confeſſion (as they call it, *viz.* that confeſſion which they make a part of the Sacrament of penance) was not inſtituted till after *Chriſts* Reſurrection; and therefore he ſayes, it is no marvell, if (as *Ambroſe* obſerves) we reade of *Peters* teares, but not of his confeſſion. That the Jewes therefore, when they were baptized of *John*, confeſſed their ſinnes, *Mat.* 3. 5, 6. is not enough to prove that confeſſion, which we now diſpute of, although it did appeare that the confeſſion there ſpoken of, was a particular confeſſion, which yet appeares not. Cardinall *Cajetane* ſaith it was but a generall confeſſion. Neither indeed in probability could it be any more; for how ſhould *John* have been able to heare ſuch multitudes, as came unto him to be baptized (*Jeruſalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, Mat.* 3.5.) confeſſe all their ſinnes in particular? That it was no generall confeſſion, but in particular, the Marqueſſe ſaith appeares by *Acts* 19. 18, 19. But if this confeſſion ſpoken of *Acts* 19. were in particular, doth it follow, that therefore the other mentioned, *Mat.* 3. was ſo alſo? I ſee no force at all in this conſequence, the confeſſions being made by ſeverall perſons, at ſeverall times, and upon ſeverall occaſions. * *Cajetan* indeed doth parallell theſe two places together, but ſo as that he maketh them both

Bell. de Pœnitent. lib. 3. cap. 20.

Cajet. in Act. 19. 18.

* Quemadmodum ad Baptiſmum Joannis concurrebant confitentes peccata ſua, ita modò deſcribuntur confitentes facta ſua, procul dubio in genere, aut publica; neutra enim fuit confeſſio Sacramentalis, ſed profeſſio pœnitentiæ vitæ præteritæ. *Cajet. in Act. 19.*

to ſpeake of a generall confeſſion, or a confeſſion onely of ſuch ſinnes as were publick and notorious. Neither of them (hee ſaith) was a ſacramentall confeſſion, but onely a profeſſion that they did repent of their life paſt. However, theſe places of Scripture can make nothing for Popiſh confeſſion, which is injoyned, and forced, as without which (they ſay) ſalvation is not to be expected; but this which the Scriptures here ſpeake of, was voluntary and free, the perſons that confeſſed, did it of their own accord. The Popiſh confeſſion is auricular (as it is called) ſecret, in the eare of a Prieſt; this appeares to have been open and publick. The Popiſh confeſſion is a particular enumeration of all known ſinnes; this if it were of any particular ſinnes at all (as that mentioned *Acts* 19. may ſeeme to have been) yet onely of ſuch as more eſpecially did trouble their conſcience, as may be collected from *Acts* 19.20. and in ſuch a caſe to confeſſe not onely unto God, but alſo unto men, and eſpecially unto Miniſters, Proteſtants doe not condemne, but hold requiſite; onely they condemne that manner of confeſſion, which in the Church of *Rome* is maintained and practiſed. And no marvell, ſeeing ſome of the Roman Church themſelves have ſhewed a great diſlike of it. *Beatus Rhenanus*, a man of great learning, and never (that I know) withdrawing from the communion of the Church of *Rome*, ſpeakes of the Romiſh confeſſion as a thing but of late deviſed, and by himſelfe little obſerved. Hee cites alſo one *Grilerius*, whom he calles a grave and holy Divine, that was a long time Preacher at *Strasburg*, who (hee ſaith) did often teſtifie among his friends, that according to the late Roman dictates, it is impoſſible to confeſſe, and thereupon did write a Booke in the *German* tongue, which he intituled, *Of the diſeaſe of confeſſion*, then which diſeaſe (ſaith *Rhenanus*) they that are troubled with it, deny that any is more grievous.

Cæterùm Thomas ab Aquino, & Scotus, homines nimium arguti, confeſſionem hodie talem reddiderunt, ut Joannes ille Grilerius gravis ac ſanctus theologus, qui tot annis Argentorati concionatus eſt, apud amicos ſuos ſæpè teſtatus ſit, juxta illorum deuteroſes impoſſibile eſſe confiteri. —— Proinde motus fuit ut libellum ederet in linguâ Germanicâ, cui titulum fecit, De morbo confeſſionis, quo negabant eſſe triſtiorem, qui eo tenebantur: B. *Rhen. in Tertull. de Pœnitent.*

For the Fathers cited by the Marqueſſe, the ſuppoſed *Clemens*, whatſoever he ſay, need not much trouble us; the Epiſtles going

ing under his name, are ſuſpected, and ſcrupled at by *Bellarmine* himſelfe in his Booke of Eccleſiaſticall Writers: and therefore (it ſeemes) he thought it not meete to alledge his authority in this point, as the Marqueſſe doth. *Origen* alſo is cited *li.* 3. a ſtrange citation; I ſuppoſe it ſhould be in *Levit. Hom.* 3. for thence *Bellarmine* doth fetch a teſtimony to prove their confeſſion. But when as *Chemnitius* alledged ſomething out of thoſe Homilies upon *Leviticus* againſt Popiſh Traditions, aſcribing them unto *Cyrill* (as alſo the *Rhemiſts* doe, adding that ſome ſay they are *Origens*) *Bellarmine* anſwers with diſdaine, that thoſe Homilies are not *Cyrils*, but *Origens*, or ſome others hee could not tell whoſe, who did deſtroy the Letter of the Scripture, that he might eſtabliſh myſticall ſenſes out of his own head: and that therefore thoſe Homilies are of no great authority. But were the authority of thoſe Homilies never ſo great, and unqueſtionable, I ſee not how they make any thing for that confeſſion, which our adverſaries maintaine, and wee impugne. *Hom.* 3. * *Origen* (or who ever was the author) ſaith that *if wee prevent Satan, and accuſe our ſelves, we ſhall eſcape the malice of Satan, Who is our adverſary, and our accuſer.* But to whom we ſhould accuſe our ſelves, by confeſſing our ſins, this Author ſhews not. *Bellarmin* indeed ſaith, that hee ſpeakes of confeſſing unto a Prieſt; but in the words (as *Bellarmine* himſelfe doth cite them) there is neither Prieſt, nor any other, to whom confeſſion of ſinne ſhould be made, expreſſed. And farre more congruous it is to underſtand it ſo, that as Satan doth accuſe us unto God (as he accuſed *Iob*, though falſly, *Iob* 1. and 2. And ſee *Revel.* 12.10.) So we ſhould prevent him by accuſing our ſelves, and confeſſing our ſinnes unto God alſo. Indeed *Hom.* 2. that author doth ſpeake of confeſſing ſinne unto a Prieſt, but that is onely in ſome ſpeciall caſe, when ſinne doth lie ſo ſore upon the conſcience, That * *a ſinner doth waſh his bed with his*

Bell. de Pœn. lib. 3. cap. 7.

Rhem. in Iob. 20.23.

Reſpondeo, Homilias illas in Leviticum non eſſe *B. Cyrilli*, ſed *Origenis*, vel neſciocujus alterius, qui paſſim literam deſtruit, ut myſticos ſenſus è capite ſuo ſtatuat. Proinde Homilias iſtas non eſſe magnæ authoritatis. *Bell. de verb. Dei lib.* 4. *cap.* 11.

* Si ergo in vitâ prævenimus eis, & ipſi noſtri accuſatores ſimus, nequitiam diaboli inimici noſtri, & accuſatoris effugiemus. Sic enim & alibi Propheta dicit, Dic tu iniquitates tuas prior, ut juſtificeris. *Orig. in Levit. Hom.* 3.

* Cum lavat peccator in lachrymis ſtratum ſuum, & fiunt ei lachrymæ ſuæ panes die ac nocte, &c. *Orig. Hom.* 2. *in Levit.*

teares, and his teares are his meat day & night. In which case, no Protestants (that I know) but hold it good and requisite to lay open the malady to such as are most likely to apply a remedy. Thus also seemes that to be understood, which the Marquesse bringeth out of *Paulinus* writing the life of *Ambrose*, (for that is meant by the quotation, which is mis-printed, *Amb. Ex Paulsino*) *viz.* that *Ambrose* sat to heare confession. *Paulinus* saith of *Ambrose*, that he would rejoyce with those that did rejoyce, and weep with those that wept. And that whensoever any came to confesse their sinnes unto him, hee would so weepe, as to constraine the party confessing to weepe also. The Marquesse further citeth *Ambr. Orat. in muliere peccatrice*; it should be, I presume, *in mulierem peccatricem*; but I finde no such peece among *Ambrose* his workes. However, if *Ambrose* any where doth say (as hee is cited) *confesse freely to the Priest the hidden sinnes of thy soule*, yet it doth not appeare that hee doth require this otherwise then in the case before mentioned. *Irenæus* also is cited *lib. 1. cap. 9.* and *Tertull. lib. de Pœnitent.* Now these speak of publike confession, and so speake not to our Adversaries purpose: the very word which they use for confession, *viz. Exomologesis*, is commonly so used for that confession, which is publike. *Irenæus* speakes of some Women, who had followed *Marcus* an Heretick, but when they were converted to the Church, they confessed their wickednesse; their sinne being open and scandalous, they made open and publike confession of it. It's true, *Irenæus* saith that those women confessed how they had beene defiled by *Marcus*, and how much they had loved him, which was more then any could have known but by their own confession. Yet this hinders not, but that the confession was publike; they first confessing publikely that which was publikely known, to shew the sincerity of their Repentance the more, might proceede to confesse also that which was secret, yet was a concomitant of that which was publike, *viz.* their adhering unto the Heretick. *Tertullian* also clearly speakes of publike confession, that which was made *inter Patres atque conservos*, amongst Brethren and fellow-servants, so that the

Erat enim gaudentibus cum gaudentibus, & flens cum flentibus. Siquidem quotiescunque illi aliquis ob percipiendam pœnitentiam lapsus suos confessus esset, ita flebat, ut & illum flere compelleret.. *Paulin. in vitâ Ambros.*

Agit de pœnitentiâ publicâ, quam exomologesin vocat. *Pamel. in Tertull. de Pœn.*

Tertull. de Pœn. cap. 10.

the whole body would grieve for the paine of one member. * *The body* (ſaith he) *cannot rejoyce at the paine of one member. It muſt needs, all ſorrow with it, and labour together for a remedy.* *Tertullian* makes no mention of ſecret confeſſion of ſins, as †*Rhenanus* obſerves, who conceiveth that ſecret confeſſion did ariſe from publick confeſſion, people of their owne accord confeſſing ſecret ſinnes ſecretly, as they uſed to confeſſe open ſins openly. *For* (ſaith he) *We no where read that this (ſecret confeſſion) was injoyned*; he means by the Ancients.

* Non poteſt corpus de unius membri vexatione lætum agere. Condoleat univerſum, & ad remedium conlaboret neceſſe eſt. *Tertull. Ibid.*

† Non aliam ob cauſam compluriũ hic teſtimoniis uſi ſumus, quàm ne quis admiretur Tertullianum de clanculariâ iſtâ admiſſorum confeſſione nihil locutũ; quæ quantum conjicimus, nata eſt exiſtâ exomologeſi per ultroneam hominum pietatem, ut occultorum criminum eſſet & exomologeſis occulta. *Rhen. in Tert. de Pœnit.* Ubi addit, Nec enim uſquam præceptam eſſe legimus.

One Father more there is, whom the Marqueſſe here citeth, namely *Chryſoſtome, lib. 3. de Sacerdot.* So *Bellarmine* having alledged ſomething out of the former book of *Chryſoſtome*, bids ſee alſo the third book. But (no doubt) if there had been any thing more for *Bellarmines* purpoſe in the third book then in the ſecond, he would have been ſo good, as to have ſet it before us. Now the very words of *Chryſoſtome*, as *Bellarm:* cites out of *lib. 2. de ſacerd.* do ſhew that he ſpeaks not of a neceſſity lying upon all to confeſſe all their ſinnes to a Miniſter, but onely that *Chriſtiani qui laborant*, Chriſtians that are in a perplexed eſtate have need of this remedy. Having thus ſhewed that the Fathers teſtifie nothing for Popiſh confeſſion, I ſhall ſhew how they teſtifie againſt it.

Bell. de Pœnit. l. 3. c. 9. Vide etiam lib. 3. de Sacerdotio.

And to begin with him that was laſt mentioned, *Chryſoſtome* is moſt copious in this kind. *Why art thou aſhamed* (ſaith he) *and doeſt bluſh to confeſſe thy ſinnes? Doeſt thou ſpeak to a man, that he may upbraid thee? Doeſt thou confeſſe to thy fellow ſervant, that he may * inſult over thee? To thy Lord, to him that hath a care of thee: to him that is kind, to the Phyſitian thou doeſt ſhew thy wound.* Here he takes it for granted, that there is (ordinarily) no neceſſity of confeſſing to any but to God onely. So againe, *Art thou aſhamed* (ſaith he) *to ſay that thou haſt ſinned? Confeſſe then daily in thy * prayer. For doe I ſay, confeſſe to thy fellow ſervant, who may reproach thee? No, confeſſe unto God, who doth cure thee.* Diverſe ſuch ſayings hath this Father, moſt plain and pregnant

Chryſoſt. com. 4. de Lazar.

* *Or* traduce thee ἐκτομπεύσῃ.

Chryſoſt. in Pſal. 50.

* ἐν τῇ ἐυχῇ σε: ſome read ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σε, in thy ſoul.

Bell. de Pœn. l. 3. c. 15.

nant for our purpoſe; *Bellarmine* with all his art and all his induſtry was not able to give a ſatisfactory anſwer to them. He ſaith that *Chryſoſtome* ſpake onely of publick Confeſſion, not of private; onely of that which is made in the open Congregation, not of that which is made to a Prieſt in ſecret. But it is evident that *Chryſoſtome* ſpeaks againſt the neceſſity of confeſſing to any but onely unto God. He bids *Confeſſe in thy ſoul. Make confeſſion in thy thought. Let God onely ſee thee confeſſing.* Such confeſſion as this, man hath nothing to do with either in publick or in private. *Bellarmine* anſwers, that in theſe places *Chryſoſtome* doth ſpeak of confeſſion, not as it hath reference to the Prieſts abſolution, but as it hath reference to ſhame and confuſion: and in this latter reſpect he ſaith *Chryſoſtome* doth well admoniſh, that it is not neceſſary to confeſſe unto man either in publique or in private, but that it ſufficeth to confeſſe with ſorrow and tears unto God onely. But here *Bellarmine* (a thing not unuſuall with him) doth contradict himſelf. For here he granteth that to confeſs only unto God is enough to work ſhame; yet in another place he ſaith, *That ſhame uſeth not to be feared in that confeſſion, which is made onely unto God.* And again, *Shamefac'dneſſe hath no place in that confeſſion which is made onely unto God.* Theſe aſſertitions, as they agree not with the truth, ſee *Ezr. 9.6.* ſo neither do they agree with the anſwer that here *Bellarmine* giveth unto *Chryſoſt:* Where as *Bellarm:* ſaith, that *Chryſoſt:* ſpeaketh not of confeſſion, as having reference to the Prieſts abſolution, it is eaſily granted, there being (ordinarily) no neceſſity of any ſuch abſolution. *Chryſoſtme* willeth a man to confeſſe, though but in his heart, unto God, aſſuring him that thereby he ſhall obtain Gods abſolution: and what need then of any others abſolution? Except in ſome ſpeciall caſe, *viz.* for the quieting of a troubled conſcience, and that one may the better enjoy the comfort of Gods abſolution. Thus for *Chryſoſtme: Auſtine* alſo doth ſhew the no-neceſſity of confeſſing unto men, which ſtill muſt be underſtood excepting ſome particular caſe, wherein it may be requiſite,

Dicito quotidiè in animâ tuâ. *Chryſoſt. in Pſal.* 50. *uti legit Bellarminus.*

Cogitatione fiat delictorum exquiſitio——Solus te Deus confitentem videat. *Chryſoſt. hom. de Pœn. & Confeſſ.*

Confuſio timeri non ſolet in confeſſione, quæ ſoli Deo fit. *Bell. de Pœn. lib.* 3. *cap.* 3.

Verecundia non habet locum in confeſſione, quæ ſoli Deo fit. *Bell. de Pœn. lib.* 3. *cap.* 6.

quiſite. *What have I to doe* (ſaith he) *With men, that they ſhould hear my confeſſions, as if they could heal all my diſeaſes? Bellarmine* takes it in diſdaine, that theſe words of *Auſtine* ſhould be alledged againſt their confeſſion. This (he ſaith) is nothing elſe but to delude the ſimple. For that whoſoever reads *Auſtines* Confeſſions cannot but know, that he ſpeakes not of Sacramentall Confeſſion, but of the Confeſſion of ſinnes paſt, and forgiven by Baptiſme; which Confeſſion was made to that end, that thereby the mercy of God might be ſeen, and praiſed. But *Auſtines* words are of more force then thus to be evaded. We willingly grant that *Auſtine* ſpeaks not of Sacramentall Confeſſion, there being indeed no ſuch Confeſſion to be ſpoken of, as they call Sacramentall; no ſuch, I ſay, truly ſo called; and ſo much theſe very words of *Auſtine* doe ſufficiently teſtifie. For Sacramentall Confeſſion (as they call it) is a Confeſſion neceſſarily to be made unto a Prieſt, or elſe no remiſſion of ſin (they ſay) committed after Baptiſme can be obtained, but *Auſtine* ſhewes that ordinarily Confeſſing unto men is not neceſſary. Neither is it ſo, that *Auſtine* in his book of Confeſſions doth only ſpeak of his ſins which he had committed before he was Baptized. For in that tenth Book, where he hath the words before cited, he ſpeaketh of ſinnes, which he was guilty of long after his Baptiſme, yea even then when he was writing his Confeſſions. As namely,* impure Dreames, and nocturnall pollutions; as alſo exceſſe in Eating. Diverſe other particulars doth he alſo confeſſe, ſaying that his life was full of ſuch failings, and that all his hope was onely in Gods exceeding great mercy. To this purpoſe alſo, † *Ambroſe*, who ſpeaking of *Peter*, ſaith, *I find not what he ſpake, I find that he*

Quid mihi ergo eſt cum hominibus, ut audiant confeſſiones meas, quaſi ipſi ſanaturi ſint omnes languores meos? *Aug. Confeſſ. lib. 10. cap. 3.* 7

Hoc nihil eſt aliud niſi ſimplicibus imponere. Nemo enim libros illos legit, qui neſciat, Confeſſionem, de quâ loquitur Auguſtinus, non eſſe Sacramentalem, ſed confeſſionum peccatorum præteritorum, & per baptiſmum dimiſſorum, &c. *Bellarm. de Pœnit. lib. 3. cap. 20.*

*Adhuc vivunt in memoriâ meâ talium rerum imagines, & occurſant mihi vigilanti quidem carentes viribus, in ſomnis autem non ſolùm uſque ad delectationem, ſed etiam uſque ad conſenſionem, factumque ſimillimum. Et tantum valet imaginis illuſio in animâ meâ, & in carne meâ, ut dormienti falſa viſa perſuadeant, quod vigilanti vera non poſſunt.——Quid adhuc ſim in hoc genere mali mei, dixi bono Domino meo, &c. *Aug. Confeſſ. lib. 10. cap. 30.* Crapula non nunquam ſurrepit ſervo tuo, &c. *Ibid. c. 31.* Et talibus vita mea plena eſt, & una ſpes mea in magnâ valdè miſericordiâ tuâ. *Ibid. c 35.* † Non invenio quid dixerit, invenio quòd fleverit.—— Lavant lachrymæ delictum, quod voce pudor eſt confiteri. *Ambr. in Luc. 22.*

Wept. And hence he infers, that tears may procure pardon of ſin, though no verball Confeſſion be made of it.

Bell. de Panit. l. 3. c. 20. To this teſtimony of *Ambroſe*, *Bellarmine* anſwers, that as then Sacramentall Confeſſion was not inſtituted, and therefore 'tis no marvell, if we doe not read of *Peters* confeſſion. And 'tis very true that Sacramentall Confeſſion neither then had, nor at all hath any divine inſtitution. Again *Bellarmine* ſayes, that Tears (of which *Ambroſe* ſpeaketh) containe a kind of Confeſſion in them. This indeed is true in reſpect of God, who knowes the heart and affection from whence Tears proceed: and therefore *David* ſaith that the Lord had heard the voice of his weeping, *Pſal.* 6. 8. which ſhewes, that as the Tongue by ſpeaking, ſo the Eyes by weeping have a voice, which God doth hear. But what is this unto men, who by tears alone, without words, can under-

Bell. Ibid. ſtand little? *Bellarmine* grants that Tears are ſufficient in that Confeſſion, which is made unto God, who knoweth all things. Well, and *Ambroſe* ſaith that Tears may ſuffice to procure pardon; and therefore no neceſſity of any other Confeſſion then what is made unto God only.

Confeſſionis autem cauſam addidit, dicens quia feciſti: autorem ſc: hujus univerſitatis Dominum eſſe confeſſus, nulli alii docens confitendum, quàm qui fecit olivam fructiferam, &c. *Hilar. in Pſal.* 51. *v. ult.*

In ſeculum, & in ſeculum ſeculi miſericordiæ ſpes eſt, ſed confeſſio tantùm in ſeculum, non etiam in ſeculum ſeculi. Non enim confeſſio peccatorum niſi in hujus ſeculi tempore eſt. *Hilar. Ibid.*

Thus alſo *Hilary* is clear for the ſufficiency of Confeſſion made onely unto God, ſaying that *David teacheth us to confeſſe only unto him, who hath made the Olive fruitfull.* It's true, the Confeſſion that *David* there (viz. *Pſal.* 52. 9.) ſpeaks of, is the Confeſſion of Praiſe and of Thankſgiving; but *Hilary* underſtands it of the confeſſion of ſins, ſaying, that *David* does not ſay, *I will confeſſe unto thee for ever and ever*, as immediately before he ſaid, *I truſt in the mercy of God for ever and ever*; but *I will confeſſe unto thee for ever*, or whiles he lived, *in ſeculum*, becauſe onely in the time of this life here are ſinnes to be confeſſed. So that however *Hilary* did miſtake *Davids* meaning, through the Ambiguity of the word *Confitebor, i. e.* I will confeſſe, or I will give thanks, yet he clearly expreſſeth his own opinion, that it is ſufficient to confeſſe unto God only.

And this opinion was maintained by ſome in the Roman Church

Church above a thouſand years after Chriſt. For *Peter Lombard* (who was above 1100 years after Chriſt) diſputing this point touching Confeſſion, confeſſeth, That *ſome thought it ſufficient to confeſſe onely unto God.* This Opinion was not accounted a Hereſie by the Church of *Rome* it ſelf untill the time of Pope *Innocent* the third, about 1200 years after Chriſt, when in the Councell of *Lateran* it was decreed neceſſary to confeſſe unto a Prieſt, and not unto God only. And therefore *Bonaventure*, who lived a little after that Councell, ſpeaking of thoſe who held it ſufficient to confeſſe only unto God, ſaith, that if any now were of that opinion, he were an Heretick, becauſe the contrary was determined in a Generall Councell, but before that determination that Opinion was no Hereſie. Thus then we ſee by the acknowledgment of the Romiſh Doctors themſelves, that the neceſſity of Sacramentall Confeſſion (as they call it) is not fetched either from Scriptures, or Fathers, but from Pope *Innocent* the Third, and the Councell that was in his time.

Quibuſdam viſum eſt ſufficere, ſi ſoli Deo fiat confeſſio. *Lomb. lib. 4. diſt. 17. lit. d.*

Si quis eſſet modò hujus opinionis, eſſet hæreticus judicandus, quoniam in concilio generali hoc determinatum eſt ſub Innocentio tertio; ſed ante hanc determinationem hoc non erat hæreſis. *Bonav. in Sent. lib. 4. diſt. 17. num. 50.*

To conclude this point touching Confeſſion, I will only adde one Argument for Confutation of the Romiſh Doctrine in this particular. Such Confeſſion as they of the Church of *Rome* require, *viz.* a particular enumeration of all mortall ſins, with all their ſeverall aggravating circumſtances, is not poſſible. And therefore neither is it of divine inſtitution. *Bellarmine* anſwers, that by this reaſon it is impoſſible to confeſſe unto God; for that we hold, that Confeſſion made unto God muſt be intire, not of ſome ſins onely, but of all. And if we ſay, that it is ſufficient to confeſſe unto God all, ſo farre forth as we can come to the knowledge of them, adding that of *David, Pſal. 19. 13. Who can underſtand his errours? Lord cleanſe me from my ſecret faults: Bellarmine* ſaith, that to confeſſe thus to a Prieſt doth ſuffice alſo. But, I ſay, this anſwer will not ſatisfie; for there is not the ſame reaſon of confeſſing unto God, and of confeſſing to a Prieſt, as they require it. God knoweth all our ſinnes before we confeſſe, farre better then we our ſelves doe; onely we are to confeſſe unto him, to ſhew our ſelves humble and penitent. But our Adverſaries ſay, that

Bell. de Pœnit. lib. 3. cap. 16.

Bell. de Punit. lib. 3. cap. 2. particular Confeſſion muſt be made unto a Prieſt, becauſe otherwiſe he cannot tell how to judge, ſo as either to remit ſinnes, or to retain them. Now to this end it is not enough to confeſſe unto a Prieſt all that one can find out, but it is neceſſary to confeſſe abſolutely all that one is guilty of. For otherwiſe how ſhall the Prieſt be able to judge of thoſe ſinnes which he knoweth not? If he cannot judge of thoſe ſins which are confeſſed, except they be confeſſed; then neither can he judge of thoſe ſins which are not confeſſed, becauſe they are not confeſſed: there is the ſame reaſon for the one as for the other. If the Prieſt can judge of thoſe ſins, that are not confeſſed, by thoſe that are confeſſed, then may he alſo, by hearing the confeſſion of one or two ſins, judge of all the reſt, though no Confeſſion be made of them. Thus the Confeſſion which our Adverſaries contend for, is either not poſſible, or at leaſt not neceſſary.

Pag. 64. After Confeſſion the Marqueſſe comes to workes of Supererogation, which they ſay a man may doe, *viz.* good works, more excellent then thoſe, which the Law of God doth require. And that a man may doe ſuch workes, the Marqueſſe proves, by *Mat.* 19. 12. *There be eunnches, that have made themſelves eunuches for the Kingdome of Heaven: he that is able to receive it, let him receive it.*

This (the Marqueſſe ſaith) is more then a Commandement, as S. *Aug.* obſerves upon the place, *Ser. lib. de temp.* (it ſhould be *Serm.* 61. *de temp.*) for of precepts it is not ſaid, *Keep them who is able*, but keep them abſolutely. I anſwer, it is true of generall precepts, ſuch as concern all, they are to be kept abſolutely by all; but for ſpeciall precepts, which concern only ſome, they are only to be kept by thoſe whom they do concern. And ſo thoſe words, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it*, are a precept, but limited and reſtrained, *viz.* unto ſome certain perſons, who otherwiſe can, without inconvenience, live a ſingle life; they are required to doe it, not as a thing ſimply neceſſary, but as neceſſary for them; not as a thing wherein perfection doth conſiſt, but as a means whereby the better to draw towards perfection, *viz. To ſerve the Lord without diſtraction*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 35. Neither doe the Fathers (whom the Marqueſſe citeth) hold any ſuch works of Supererogation, as the Romaniſts plead for, *viz.* works more

more excellent and perfect then thoſe which the Law of God preſcribeth. * *Ambroſe* ſeemes to ſpeake more then the reſt, and therefore it may be hee is put in the firſt place, though ſome that are cited, are more ancient then hee. *They that have fulfilled the precept* (hee ſaith) *may ſay, Wee are unprofitable ſervants, wee have done what our duty was to doe. This the Virgin ſaith not, nor hee that ſold his Goods, viz.* to give to the poore.

* Qui præceptum impleverint, dicere poſſunt, Servi inutiles ſumus, quod debuimus facere, fecimus. Hoc virgo non dicit; non dicit ille, qui bona ſua vendidit. *Ambr. de viduis.*

Thus *Ambroſe*; but have not theſe words need of a favourable interpretation? For will our adverſaries themſelves ſay, that there are any abſolutely ſo perfect, as that they need not confeſſe unto God, that they are unprofitable ſervants? what they will ſay I cannot tell, but ſure I am that Chriſts Diſciples, who were as perfect as any others, were not ſo perfect. For even to them did Chriſt ſpeake thoſe words, *When yee ſhall have done all theſe things, which are commanded you, ſay, Wee are unprofitable ſervants, wee have done but what was our duty to doe. Luke* 17.10. It may be our Adverſaries will ſay, true, when they had done all things commanded them, they were to ſay, *we are unprofitable ſervants, &c.* but not when they had done more then was commanded them. But did they ſo? They left all indeed, and followed Chriſt; but did not Chriſt call them to it, and command them to doe it? In this therefore they did no more then their duty was to doe. We muſt diſtinguiſh therefore betwixt generall duties, and ſpeciall duties. All were not bound to forſake all actually, as the Apoſtles did, and to follow Chriſt, becauſe there was no generall precept for it; but the Apoſtles were bound to do it, becauſe they had a ſpeciall call and command from Chriſt, that did oblige them to it. Thus then *Ambroſes* words muſt be underſtood, that in reſpect of a generall precept obliging all to the thing done, ſome may be ſaid to doe more then their duty was to doe, though ſimply and abſolutely they did not more. For if it were more for Gods glory to doe what they did, then not to doe it, they were bound to doe it. For elſe how did they love God with all their heart, and with all their ſoule, and with all their might? as all

are commanded to doe, *Deut.*5.6. * *Origen* is next cited, who saith that such as live in virginity, doe not that which is commanded, but above what is due. But the meaning is, that virginity is not a thing generally commanded, not a duty required of all; yet to some, who have the gift, and are called of God to improve it to the greater advancement of his glory, it is a duty; every one is bound to doe that, which doth make most for Gods glory, that being the end for which wee ought doe whatsoever wee doe. 1 *Cor.*10.31.

* Virginitas non ex debito solvitur: neque enim per præceptum expetitur, sed supra debitum offertur. *Origen. in cap.* 15. *ad Rom.*

*Euseb. demonstr. Evang.l.*1.*c.*8.

After *Origen* followes *Eusebius*, who saith, that *in the Church of God two kindes of life are instituted; one exceeding our nature, and the common course of life, not seeking marriage, nor off-spring, nor substance, but addicted wholly to Gods worship. And this is the manner of a perfect life in Christianity. The other kinde of life is more remisse, and humane, which is intangled in modest wedlock, and procreation of children,*&c. *To such belongeth the second degree of piety.* Thus *Eusebius*, who yet is far from asserting such workes of supererogation as are now disputed of. We grant, that to live unmarried so as thereby the better and the more freely to serve God, is a life of more perfection then to live married, and so to be entangled with the affaires of the world. But we deny, that they who so live unmarried, doe supererogate, *i.e.* that they not only do all that is commanded, but also over and above what is commanded. This neither doth *Eusebius* say, neither can it be proved.

Multi & ipsa superant mandata. *Chrysost. hom.* 8. *de pœnit.*

Next comes *Chrysostome*, who may seeme to speake much, but indeed it is not much to the purpose. *Hee* saith that *many doe exceede the Commandements.* But how is that? Not in respect of the whole latitude of the Commandements; for (as *David* testifies) they are exceeding broad. *Psal.* 119.96. It is therefore onely in respect of some outward act, which is not directly and precisely commanded. And thus, *Chrysostome* sayes that the Heathens, many of them, did exceede the Commandements; and yet (I presume) our Adversaries will not ascribe

Nonne præcepta Dei adeò levia sunt, ut multi philosophicâ tantùm ratione illa excesserint? *Chrys. Hom.*3.*in* 1. *ad Corinth.*

any

any extraordinary perfection to the Heathens. The teſtimony then of *Chryſoſtome* makes but little for their works of ſupererogation, except they will acknowledge ſuch workes to have been done by Heathens, many of which might forbear marriage; ſo the veſtall Virgins did; and this was according to *Chryſoſtomes* manner of ſpeech, to exceede the Commandements, namely to go beyond that, *Thou ſhalt not commit adultery*. But conſider this (and ſo any other) Commandement in the full extent of it, as forbidding all wanton lookes, and all unchaſt thoughts, *Mat.* 5. 28. *Job.* 31. 1. and ſo neither the Veſtall nor the Popall Virgins will finde any great cauſe of boaſting.

The laſt Father here cited, is *Gregory* (*Nicen.* in the Marqueſſes paper is to be blotted out, as ſuperfluous, this here cited being not *Gregory Niſſen.* but *Gregory* ſirnamed *the great*, Biſhop of *Rome*) who ſaith, *The elect ſometimes doe more then God hath vouchſafed to command. For bodily virginity is not commanded, but onely commended; for if it were commanded, then marriage would be a fault. And yet many live in virginity, and ſo performe more then the Commandement doth require of them.* It is true, there is no precept directly commanding virginity, and in that reſpect they that live in virginity may be ſaid to doe more then the Commandement doth require of them. Yet if any have the ſpeciall gift given of God, and ſee it a meanes whereby the more to glorifie God, then by conſequence the precept of loving God with all our heart, and with all our ſoule, and with all our might, *Deut.* 6. 5. and of doing all to the glory of God, 1 *Cor.* 10. 31. theſe precepts (I ſay) in ſuch a caſe doe require virginity. But (alas!) what is all this that hath beene alledged both from Scriptures and Fathers, to prove workes of ſupererogation? to prove that men may not onely doe all that is commanded, but alſo more then is commanded? How will this conſiſt with the Scriptures, which tell us, *There is not a juſt man upon earth that doth good, and ſinneth not.* Eccleſ. 7. 20. *In many things We offend all.* Jam. 3. 2. *If God ſhall contend with us, Wee cannot anſwer him one of a thouſand,* Job 9. 3. And doe not

Greg Moral. lib. 15. cap. 9. Electi nonnunquam plus ſtudent agere quàm eis dignatus eſt Dominus jubere. Carnis enim Virginitas nequaquam juſſa eſt, ſed laudata; nam ſi illa juberetur, conjugium jam culpa crederetur, & tamen multi virtute virginitatis pollent, ut plus impendant obſequio, quàm acceperunt præcepto.

not the Fathers concurre with the Scriptures in this? *Then are wee righteous* (saith [a] *Hierome*) *when wee confesse our selves to be sinners.* And againe, [b] *This is the onely perfection of men, that they know themselves to be imperfect.* So [c] Leo, *This is the true righteousnesse of those that are perfect, that they never presume themselves to be perfect.* Thus also [d] *Gregory* the great, *If God shall strictly examine us, What hope of salvation is there for us? when as our evill deeds, are simply evill, but the good deeds, which we suppose wee have, cannot be simply good.* And againe, [e] *The Saints know that all mans righteousnesse is found to be unrighteousnesse, if God doe strictly judge it.*

a Tunè justi sumus, quando nos peccatores fatemur. *Hieron dial. advers. Pelag. lib. 1.*

b Hæc hominibus sola perfectio, si imperfectos esse se noverint. *Hieron. advers. Pelag. ad Ctesiphont.*

c Hæc est perfectorum vera justitia, ut nunquam præsumant se esse perfectos. *Leo. ser. 2. de Quadrag.*

d Si de his divinitùs districtè discutimur, quis inter hæc remanet salutis locus? quando & mala nostra pura mala sunt, & bona, quæ nos habere credimus, pura bona esse nequaquam possunt. *Greg. Moral. lib. 35. cap. 16.*

e Sciunt quippe (Sancti) quia omnis humana justitia injustitia esse deprehenditur, si divinitùs districtè judicetur. *Greg. Moral. l. 21. c. 15.*

Page 64. After workes of Supererogation, the Marquesse passeth to *Free-will*, saying that they hold that wee have *Free-will*, and that we deny it. But a question should be stated, before it be disputed; we doe not deny, that we have *Free-will*, though wee deny that our will is so free, now in the estate of corrupt nature, as that wee have of our selves, any ability to that which is truly good. * *Calvin* allowes both the name of *Free-Will*, and also the thing it selfe, so it be rightly understood, *viz.* that the will of man is free, as freedome is opposed to coaction, the will is so free, as that it cannot be compelled or constrained. But that the will is free as to be able of it selfe to chuse either good or

* Egò verò quantum ad vocempertinet, adhuc profiteor, quòd in meâ institut õe testatus sum, non adeò me superstitiosum esse in verbis, ut ejus causâ velim contentionem aliquam movere, modò rei intelligentia sana maneat. Si coactioni opponitur libertas, liberum esse arbitrium, & fateor, & constanter assevero; ac pro hæretico habeo, quisquis secùs sentiat. ——Sed cum aliud prorsus vulgò concipiant, dum hoc epitheto hominis voluntati attributum vel legunt, vel audiunt, hæc causa est, cur mihi displiceat. Siquidem ad facultatem vireſque referunt, nec impedire possis, quin simulac libera fuerit voluntas dicta, hæc pluribus imaginatio protinus in mentem veniat, habere igitur sub potestate suâ bonum & malum, ut alterutrum eligere suapte virtute queat. *Calv. contra Pigh. de lib. arbit. pag.* 215. Semper autem testatus sum, me de nomine pugnare nolle, si hoc semel constitueretur, libertatem non ad potentiam, vel facultatem boni æquè ac mali eligendi, sed ad spontaneum motum & consensum referri debere. *Ibid. p.* 229. Causam mihi justam habere videor, cur vocularn op. ē sub'atam è medio, ad quā major propè mundi pars tanto periculo impingit. *Ibid. p.* 215.

evill

evill, this is it that he contends againſt; and becauſe many when they heare or read of *Free-will*, underſtand it in this ſenſe, this made him wiſh that the very word were abandoned, many being ſo apt to ſtumble at it.

* *Chamier* a famous Proteſtant Writer, ſhewes that our Divines diſputing againſt *Free-Will*, doe not ſimply deny it, but in this ſenſe, that the will is equally propenſe and indifferent to good and evill.

This is that, which they deny, and againſt which they bend their diſputations. *Wee doe not make a queſtion* (ſaith hee alſo) *whether the Will be free; this Wee have often teſtified, and muſt ſtill repeate it, becauſe of the importunity of our adverſaries. This then is that which We queſtion, what and how much that liberty of the will can availe in reſpect of that which is good.* And againe, *Wee have proteſted* (ſaith hee) *that Wee hold Free-Will, though not ſuch as the* Pelagians *held, nor as the Papiſts hold.*

Thus then wee hold, that ſince the fall of *Adam*, mans will is free to that which is evill, but to that which is good, it is not free, untill by the grace of Chriſt it be made free. *If the Sonne ſhall make you free* (ſaith our Saviour) *then yee ſhall be free indeed. Joh.* 8.36. But not till then. How ſhould they be free to that which is good, who are *dead in treſpaſſes and ſinnes?* as by nature all are. *Eph.* 2. 1. who are *ſold unto ſinne*; as the Apoſtle confeſſeth hee was ſo farre forth as hee was unregenerate, *Rom.* 7.14. and that in him, that is, in his fleſh (his corrupt nature) no good dwelled. *verſ.* 18. who are *the ſervants of ſinne*, as all are before their converſion, *Romans* 6. 17. In this reſpect *Luther* might well intitle his booke (as hee did) *of ſervile will*, rather then *of Free-Will*, to ſhew that this *Free-will* is by nature the ſervant of ſinne.

* Quia vix aliâ notione nominabatur lib. arbitrium, hinc noſtrorum plurimæ contrariæ diſputationes, viſæ negare fundituſ lib. arbitrium. Cum tamen certum ſit omninò non negari niſi hoc ſenſu. Quod ſatis apparet ex earum diſputationum ſerie, quibus hic ſcopus propoſitus eſt, ut hanc unam in bonum malumque æquam propenſionem ſive indifferentiam perpetuò impugnent. *Cham. tom. 3. lib. 3. ca. 1. Sect. 7.* Noſtra nulla quæſtio eſt, utrùm ſua ſit arbitrio libertas, quod ſæpè teſtatum ſæpiùs repetendum eſt propter adverſariorum importunitatem. Quid ergò? Nempe quid quantumque ea valeat ad bonum voluntas, anquirimus. *Ibid. c.* 14. *Sect.* 6.

Nos proteſtati ſumus tenere liberum arbitrium, & ſi non quale ſtatuerunt *Pelagiani*; non etiam quale ſtatuunt Papiſtæ. *Ibid. cap.* 17. *Sect.* 5.

De ſervo arbitrio. Indicans diſputari in eo, illud Liberum arbitrium verè eſſe peccati ſervum. *Cham. tom.* 3. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 8. *Sect.* 9.

Quid enim boni operari potest perditus, nisi quantum fuerit à perditione liberatus? Nunquid libero voluntatis arbitrio? Et hoc absit. Nam libero arbitrio malè utens homo & se perdidit, & ipsum. Sicut enim qui se occidit, utique vivendo se occidit, sed se occidendo non vivit, nec seipsum resuscitare potest cum occiderit: ita cum libero peccaretur arbitrio, victore peccato amissum est liberum arbitrium. A quo enim quis devictus est, huic & servus addictus est.---Qualis, quæque potest servi addicti esse libertas, nisi quando peccare eum delectat? Ac per hoc ad peccandum liber est, qui peccati servus est. Unde ad justè faciendum liber non erit, nisi à peccato liberatus esse justitiæ cœperit servus. *Aug. Enchir. cap.* 30.

S. *Augustine* in many places is as cleare, and expresse for this which wee hold, as can be imagined. *For what good* (saith he) *can lost man worke, but so farre forth as hee is freed from that lost condition? can hee by Free-will? No such matter. For man using Free-will amisse, lost both himselfe and it. For as hee that killes himselfe, doth by living kill himselfe, but by killing himselfe hee ceaseth to live: So when by Free-Will man did sinne, sinne getting the victory, Free-will was lost. For of Whom a man is overcome, of the same hee is brought in bondage.* (2 Pet. 2. 19.) *What, I pray, can be the freedome of one that is brought into bondage, except when it doth delight him to sinne? And by this hee is free to sinne, who is the servant of sinne. Wherefore hee shall not be free to doe righteously, unlesse being made free from sinne hee shall become the servant of righteousnesse.* And presently after, *But that freedome, Which is to doe well, how shall man being in bondage, and sold under sinne have, except hee redeeme him, Who hath said, If the Sonne shall make you free, then you shall be free indeed? Before this begin to be done in man, how can any glory of Free-will in a good worke, seeing hee is not yet free to doe well?*

Sed ista libertas ad benefaciendum unde erit homini addicto, & vendito, nisi redimat ille, cujus illa vox est; Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc verè liberi eritis? Quod antequam fieri in homine incipiat, quomodo quisquam de libero arbitrio in bono gloriatur opere, qui nondum liber est ad operandum benè? *Ibid.*

Amittitur liberum arbitrium, non cum perit, quod fieri non potest, sed cum à diabolo captivatur; quomodo dicuntur amissa, quæ tempore belli in potestatem hostium venerunt. *Bell. de grat. & lib. arb. l. 5. c. 30.*

Bellarmine brings in the first peece of this saying of *Austine*, and answers, that *Free-will is lost, not in that it is quite abolished, but in that it is held captive by the Devill; as things are said to be lost, Which in time of war are in the power of the enemy.* But what is this but even to yeeld us that which wee contend for? For if *Free-Will* bee so lost, as to bee held captive by Satan, then surely the will, untill it be set free by Christ, is not free in respect of that which is truly good, and accompanying salvation.

This

This will (ſaith *Auſtine*) *which is free in things that are evill, becauſe it is delighted in things that are evill, is therefore not free in things that are good, becauſe it is not made free.*

Sed hæc voluntas, quæ libera eſt in malis, quia delectatur malis, ideò libera in bonis non eſt, quia liberata non eſt. *Aug. ad Bonifac. contra duas epiſt. Pelagian. cap. 3.*

And againe, *Without the Grace of God the will cannot be free, ſeeing it is ſubject to luſts that doe overcome it, and bring it into bondage.*

Sine gratia Dei non poteſt eſſe libera voluntas, cum cupiditatibus vincentibus & vincientibus ſubdita ſit. *Aug. epiſt. 144.*

And again, *How dare miſerable men be proud of Free-will, before they are made free?* Theſe, and many other Sentences of this Father, are ſo full for our purpoſe, that our Divines might well profeſſe (as they doe) that in this point they fully accord with *Auſtine*. But I will adde the teſtimonies of ſome other Fathers beſides him.

Ut quid miſeri homines audent ſuperbire de libero arbitrio, antequam liberentur? *Aug. de Spir. & lit. c. 30.* Hinc illa, quam uni Auguſtino, præ aliis tribuo, veræ ſanæque doctrinæ perſpicua, certa, exactaque explicatio: hinc & ille conſenſus, quem illi nobiſcum eſſe glorior. *Calv. contra Pigh. pag. 225.* Auguſtinum a ſervi prorſus eſſe noſtrum. *Ibid. pag. 227.* Totam de libero arbitrio doctrinam Auguſtini Calvinus probavit, nos eandem probamus, dummodo æſtimetur ex ejus diſputationibus contra Pelagianos. *Cham. Tom. 3. lib. 3. cap. 18. ſect. 5.*

While ſin reignes (ſaith *Fulgentius*) *a man hath Free-will, but free without God, not free under God, that is, free from Righteouſneſſe, not free under Grace, and ſo moſt ill, and ſlaviſhly free, becauſe not made free by the free gift of God ſhewing mercy.* This he proves by *Rom. 6. 22.* and addes, *Therefore he cannot ſerve Righteouſneſſe, who is free from Righteouſneſſe; becauſe ſo long as he is the ſervant of ſinne, he is onely able to ſerve him.* To the ſame effect alſo ſpeaks *Bernard*, *By I know not what evill and wonderfull means* (ſaith he) *the Will being changed by ſinne, and made worſe, doth bring a neceſſity upon it ſelfe, ſo that neceſſitas illecta, excludere neceſſitatem.* Eſt n. neceſſitas hæc quodammodo voluntaria.——Voluntas enim eſt, quæ ſe cum eſſet libera, ſervam fecit peccati, peccato aſſentiendo: voluntas nihilominus eſt, quæ ſe ſub peccato tenet voluntariè ſerviendo. *Bernard. Serm. 81. in Cant.*

Regnante peccato habet liberum arbitrium, ſed liberum ſine Deo, non liberum ſub Deo, *i. e.* liberum juſtitiæ, non liberum ſub gratiâ, & ab hoc peſſimè atque ſerviliter liberum, quia non gratuito miſerentis Dei munere liberatũ. (*Probat ex Rom. 6. 22. atque addit*) Servire igitur juſtitiæ non poteſt, quia juſtitiæ liber eſt; quia quamdiu eſt peccati ſervus, non niſi ad ſerviendum peccato reperitur idoneus. *Fulgent. ad Pet. Diacon. cap. 19.*

Neſcio quo pravo & miro modo ipſa ſibi voluntas peccato quidem in deterius mutata, neceſſitatem fecit, ut nec neceſſitas, cum ſit voluntaria, excuſare valeat voluntatem, nec voluntas, cum

ther neceſſity, being voluntary, can excuſe the Will, nor the will, being inticed, can exclude neceſſity. For it is after a ſort a voluntary neceſſity.——For it is the Will, which when it was free, made it ſelf the ſervant of ſinne, by conſenting unto ſinne; nevertheleſſe it is the will, which keeps it ſelf under ſin, by ſerving it willingly. He ſhewes how the will is free, being captivated by ſin, ſo free as that it ſinneth willingly, yet not ſo free, as that it can refrain from ſin, ſeeing it hath made it ſelfe the ſervant of ſinne, and hath brought upon it ſelf a neceſſity of ſinning. *Thus* (ſaith he) *the ſoul, after a wonderfull, and evill manner, under this voluntary and ill free neceſſity is both held in bondage, and alſo is free: in bondage, becauſe of neceſſity, free, becauſe of will. And which is more wonderfull, and more miſerable, it is therefore guilty, becauſe it is free, and therefore in bondage, becauſe guilty, and ſo conſequently therefore in bondage becauſe free.* He addes a little after, *Now there is no eſcape for miſerable man,* (by his own free-will, or any power in himſelf) *whom (as I have ſaid) both the Will doth make inexcuſable, and alſo neceſſity doth make incorrigible.* Elſewhere indeed *Bernard* ſeems to make the wil perpetually, and of its own nature free from neceſſity, for that neceſſary and voluntary ſeeme to be contrary one to the other. But by neceſſity he means co-action and compulſion: For ſpeaking of conſent, he ſaith, *It is not compelled, it is not extorted; for it is of Will, not of neceſſity. It neither denies it ſelfe, nor affords it ſelfe to any, but willingly. For if it could be compelled againſt its Will, it were violent, and not voluntary. But where there is no will, there is no conſent. For there is no conſent, but voluntary. Therefore where there is conſent, there is will: and where there is will, there is freedom: and this is that which I think is called Free-will.*

Ita anima miro quodam & malo modo ſub hâc voluntariâ quâdam ac malè liberâ neceſſitate & ancilla tenetur, & libera; ancilla propter neceſſitatem, libera propter voluntatem: & quod magis mirum magiſque miſerum eſt, eo rea quo libera, eoque ancilla quo rea, ac per hoc eo ancilla quo libera. *Bern. Ibid.*

Nunc verò nuſquam exitus miſero patet, quem & voluntas (ut dixi) inexcuſabilem, & incorrigibilem neceſſitas facit. *Bern. Ibid.*

Eſt verò quam magis ei congruere arbitror libertatem, quam dicere poſſumus à neceſſitate, eò quòd neceſſarium voluntario contrarium eſſe videatur. *Bern. de grat. & lib. arb.*

Siquidem non cogitur, non extorquetur. Eſt quippe voluntatis, non neceſſitatis. Nec negat ſe, nec præbet cuiquam niſi ex voluntate. Alioqui ſi compelli valet invitus, violentus eſt, non voluntarius. Ubi autem voluntas non eſt, nec conſenſus. Non eſt enim conſenſus niſi voluntarius. Ubi ergo conſenſus, ibi voluntas. Porrò ubi voluntas, ibi libertas. Et hoc eſt quod dici puto liberum arbitrium. *Bern. Ibid.*

And

And againe, *Freedome from neceſſity* (ſaith he) *doth equally belong unto God, and to every reaſonable creature, as well bad as good. It is not loſt, nor diminiſhed, either by ſinne, or miſery, it is not greater in the Righteous, then in the Sinner; not more full in an Angell, then in Man. For as the conſent of mans will, being by Grace turned unto good, therefore makes a man freely good, and free in that which is good, becauſe he is made voluntary, and not drawn againſt his will: So being freely devolved into evill, it makes a man nevertheleſſe free, and ſpontaneous in evill, being led by his own will, and not compelled and enforced by any other to be evill.*

Verùm libertas à neceſſitate æquè & indifferenter Deo univerſæque tàm malæ quàm bonæ rationali convenit creaturæ. Nec peccato nec miſeriâ amittitur, vel minuitur, nec major in juſto eſt quàm in peccatore, nec plenior in angelo quàm in homin. Quomodò namque ad bonum converſus per gratiam humanæ voluntatis conſenſus, eò liberè bonum, & in bono liberum hominem facit, quò voluntarius efficitur, non invitus pertrahitur: ſic ſponte devolutus in malum, in malo nihilominus tam liberum quàm ſpontaneum conſtituit ſuâ utique voluntate ductum, non aliundè coactum ut malus ſit. *Bern. Ibid.*

Thus we ſee how *Bernard* doth agree with *Calvin* in making the freedome of mans will to conſiſt in a ſpontaneity, and a freedome from coaction; and in holding that otherwiſe the will of man (untill it be made free by Grace) is not free to that which is good, but neceſſitated unto ſin, and enſlaved by it. The freedome of the will then doth not conſiſt in this, that it is free and indifferent to chuſe either good or evil. For ſo God and the good Angels ſhould not be free, ſeeing they cannot will any thing but that which is good: neither ſhould the devils, and damned ſouls be free, ſeeing they cannot will any thing but that which is evill.

It is not therefore called Free-will (ſaith *Bradwardine*) *becauſe it can freely will, and will any thing whatſoever; but becauſe it can freely will any thing that is its object to be willed, and nill any thing that is its object to be nilled.* In vain therefore doth *Bellarmine* pretend that our Divines make man altogether voide of Free-will, for that they hold, that if he have the help of Grace he cannot doe ill; and if he want it, he cannot doe well. But it doth not follow, that therefore they wholly deny Free-will, it being rightly underſtood. For though man having the help of Grace cannot doe ill, and want-

Non ideò dicitur liberum arbitrium quia liberè poteſt velle & nolle quodcunque; ſed quia liberè poteſt velle quodcunque objectum ſuum volubile, & nolle quodcunque objectum ſuum nolubile. *Bradw. de Cauſ. Dei l. 2. c. 2.*

Affirmant præſente auxilio gratiæ non poſſe hominem malè facere, eo verò abſente non poſſe benè facere, ac per hoc nunquam habere liberum voluntatis arbitrium. *Bell. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 5. cap. 28.*

ing it cannot doe well; yet both, in doing well, by the help of Grace, and in doing ill, for want of it, his will is free, ſo as that he is not conſtrained, and forced either the one way or the other: even as both the good Angels and the bad are free in that which they do, though the one cannot do ill, nor the other well. Our Adverſaries make the will of man ſo free, as being incited by Grace, to be able to act, or not to act, as he pleaſeth. But how doth this agree with Scripture? *Who maketh thee to differ, and what haſt thou, that thou haſt not received?* 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. If a man could of himſelf, by the power of his free-will, embrace a good motion, and conſent unto it, as well as refuſe and reject it, then he may make himſelf to differ from another, and may have ſomething that he hath not received. *No man commeth unto me, except my Father draw him*, ſaith our Saviour, *Joh.* 6. 44. * *Here is a great commendation of Grace*, (ſaith *Auſtine*) *none comes except he be drawn; whom he draws, and whom he draws not, Why he draws this man, and draws not that, doe not judge if thou wouldeſt not erre.*

Bell. de grat. & lib. art. l. 6. c. 9.

* Magna gratiæ commendatio, nemo venit niſi tractus; quem trahat, & quem non trahat, quarè illum trahat, & illum non trahat, noli velle judicare, ſi non vis errare. *Aug. homil.* 26. *citat. à Bradw. de Cauſ. Dei l.* 1. *c.* 35.

The Apoſtle tells us, That *We are not ſufficient of our ſelves to think any thing as of our ſelves, but all our ſufficiency is of God*, 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. By which words of the Apoſtle *Bernard* proves that it is not in the power of mans free will without the Grace of God to conſent unto a good motion *ſeeing he cannot of himſelf ſo much as think a good thought, which yet is leſſe then to conſent unto it.* So by the ſame words *Bradwardine* confutes thoſe who hold, that if God prevent a man by knocking and inciting, then man of himſelf doth follow, by opening and conſenting. *But* (ſaith he, having cited the words of the Apoſtle) *it is leſſe to think, then to believe.* And he doth well obſerve, *That this doctrine aſcribes that which is the better, and the greater unto man, and that which is*

Non equidem quòd vel ipſe conſenſus, in quo omne meritum conſiſtit, ab ipſo ſit, cum nec cogitare (quod minus eſt quàm conſentire) aliquid à nobis quaſi ex nobis ſufficientes ſimus. *Bern. de grat. & lib. arbit.*

Sunt qui dicunt Deum ſemper prævenire pulſando, & excitando, &c. & hominem ſubſequi aperiendo, & conſentiendo, idque ex propriis viribus, &c.

——Minus eſt cogitare, quàm credere. *Bradward. de Cauſ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 38.

Hæc poſitio tribuit nobis quod melius eſt, & majus; Deo verò quod deterius, & minus. Quis enim dubitaverit aperire melius, & utilius nobis eſſe quàm pulſare? cum pulſare ſine apertione non proſit, ſed obſit. *Bradward. Ibid.*

the

the worſe and the leſſe unto God. For that without doubt it is better and more for our profit to open, then to knock, ſeeing that knocking without opening availes nothing, but is rather hurtfull. And citing a ſaying of * S. *Auſtine*. viz. *Wee live more ſafe if wee give all to God, and doe not commit our ſelves in part to him, and in part to our ſelves*; hee addes, *Therefore to him doe I wholly commit my ſelfe with my whole devotion, and to his moſt acceptable grace doe I wholly ſubmit my ſelfe.* Surely *David*, when hee prayed, *Vnite my heart to feare thy Name, Pſal.*86.11. was farre from meaning thus, that God ſhould ſo move him to obedience as that hee might either obey, or not obey, as hee pleaſed. So when hee prayed, *Let mee not wander from thy Commandements. Pſal.*119.10. And, *make mee to goe in the path of thy Commandements. v.*35. were it not moſt abſurd to underſtand it thus, *Let me not wander*, except I will; and *make mee to goe*, if I will? So when God promiſeth, *I will put my ſpirit within you, and cauſe you to walke in my ſtatutes, &c.* Ezek. 36.27. And, *I will put my fear in their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from mee. Ier.*32.40. it were moſt ridiculous to interpret it thus, *I will cauſe you to walk in my ſtatutes*, if you will, and that *you ſhall not depart from me*, except you will.

* *Aug. de bono perſeverantiæ cap.* 9. Tutiores vivimus, ſi totum Deo damus, non nos illi ex parte, & nobis ex parte committimus. Ipſi ergo me totum totâ devotione committo, ac ejus gratiſſimæ gratiæ totaliter me ſubmitto. *Bradw. Ibid.*

So when the Church prayeth *Lam.*5.21. *Turn thou us unto thee O Lord, and wee ſhall be turned*, were it not ridiculous to expound it, *wee ſhall be turned*, if we will?

God promiſeth *Ezek.*36.26. *to take away the ſtony heart*, that is, the contumacy, ſtubborneſſe and diſobedience of the heart; and *to give a heart of fleſh*, that is, to make the heart ſoft, pliable and obedient. By this and other places of Scripture *Bradwardine* confutes thoſe, who ſay, that God by his Grace will convert a man, if he doe not put a barre in the way. * *Whatſoever* (ſaith hee) *this barre is ſaid to be, none can take it away, but God; and if hee will take it away, it is irreſiſtibly taken away. Whence the Lord himſelfe ſaith, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy. Exodus* 33. *And againe, I will take away the ſtony Heart. Ezek.*36. *So the Apoſtle, He hath mercy on whom hee will have mercy, &c.* Rom. 9. After theſe Scriptures hee brings in that of *Auſtine*

* Quicquid obex dicitur; nullus poteſt hunc obicem tollere niſi Deus: & ſi ipſe eum voluerit tollere, irreſiſtibiliter tollitur. Unde & ipſemet Dominus, Miſerebor cui voluero, &c. *Exod.* 33. Et iterum, Auferam cor lapideum, &c. *Exod.* 36. Et Apoſtolus, Cujus vult, miſeretur, &c. *Rom.* 9. *Bradw. de cauſ Dei lib.* 2. *cap.* 32.

Austine, worthy to be written in Letters of gold, *This grace* (saith hee) *which by the bounty of God is secretly infused into the hearts of men, is refused by no hard heart. For therefore it is infused, that in the first place the hardnesse of the heart may bee taken away.* I'le onely adde one Scripture more, with *Austines* glosse upon it, to shew that man being stirred up by preventing grace, hath not by his own Free-will power to consent unto, and to doe that which is good, but it is God, who by his grace doth worke this in him. So the Apostle plainly tells us. *It is God,* (saith hee) *that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure.* Phil. 2. 13. Therefore (saith † *Austine*) *we will, but God doth worke this will in us : therefore wee worke, but God doth worke this worke in us of his good pleasure. This is expedient for us both to believe, and to speake : this is pious, this is true; that so confession may bee humble, and submisse, and that all may be ascribed unto God.* And thus I hope it may sufficiently appeare, that we have no cause to decline either the authority of the Scriptures, or the testimonies of Fathers, in this point concerning *Free-will.*

Et *Aug. de Prædest. SS c. 9.* Hæc gratia, quæ occultè humanis cordibus divinâ largitate tribuitur, à nullo duro corde respuitur : ideò quippe tribuitur, ut cordis duritia primitùs auferatur. *Bradw. Ibid.*

† Nos ergo volumus, sed Deus in nobis operatur & velle : nos ergo operamur, sed Deus in nobis operatur & operari pro bonâ voluntate. Hoc nobis expedit & credere, & dicere : hoc est pium, hoc verum, ut sit humilis & submissa confessio, & totum Deo detur. *Aug. de bono persever. cap.* 13.

I come now to those Scriptures, and Fathers, which the Marquesse doth alledge against us. Three places of Scripture are cited for proofe of *Free-will*, such as our Adversaries maintaine, and wee impugne. First, that 1 *Cor.* 7. 37. (it is misprinted, 1 *Cor.* 17.) *Hee that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart, that hee will keepe his virgin, doth well.* But what is there here to prove *Free-will* ? Perhaps those words, *hath power over his own will.* But the Apostle there speakes of a man, that hath a daughter marriageable, yet determines to keepe her unmarried : which the Apostle approves, so that the man *have no necessity*, that is, no necessary cause of giving his daughter in marriage, but *hath power over his owne will*, that is, hath power to effect and accomplish that which hee willeth, so as no inconvenience to ensue upon it. After this manner doth

Cajetan

* *Cajetan* himſelfe in his Commentaries upon the place expound theſe wordes *but hath power over his own will, viz.* to accompliſh it, *in that the Virgin doth conſent to abſtaine from marriage. For if ſhee ſhould diſſent, then the Father ſhould not have power of accompliſhing his own will.* Thus *Cajetan*; now what is this to the controverſie about free will? though (I know) *Bellarmine* alſo brings it in, as alſo another place as little to the purpoſe, namely that, 2 *Cor.*9.7. *Every man according as hee purpoſeth in his heart, ſo let him give, not grudgingly, or of neceſſity; for God loveth a chearfull giver.* Men muſt give almes willingly and chearfully, therefore men have free will. It doth not follow; no more then that becauſe men muſt *ſerve God with a perfect heart, and with a willing minde,* 1 *Chron.* 28. 9. therefore of themſelves by the power of *Free-will* they are able to do it. The *Rhemiſts* tacitely confeſſe theſe places to be impertinent to the point in hand, paſſing them over in their Annotations, and making no uſe of them, as they are ready enough to doe, when they meet with any thing, which they thinke doth make for them. The next place is *Deut.*30.19. (not as it is printed 11.) *I have ſet before you life and death, bleſſing and curſing; chuſe life, that thou and thy ſeed may live.* This place *Bellarmine* preſumes much upon, ſaying that hee ſees not what can bee anſwered to it. And ſo the Engliſh Papiſts, who tranſlated the old Teſtament at *Doway*, in their notes upon the place ſay, *what Doctor can more plainly teach Free-will in man, then this Text of holy Scripture?* But what is the reaſon of all this confidence? becauſe man is bidden to chuſe life, doth it therefore follow, that of himſelfe hee is free and able to doe it? why? So man is bidden to worke out his own ſalvation, *Phil.* 2.12. yet (as the Apoſtle addes immediately *v.*13.) it is God that doth worke in him both the Will and the Deed. Man is bidden to come unto Chriſt, *Iſai.*53.3. yet can hee not come, except the Father draw him. *Joh.* 6. 44. Man is bidden to ariſe from the dead, *Epheſ.*5.14. Can he therefore being dead quicken himſelf? Surely the ſame Apoſtle tells us in the ſame Epiſtle, that it is God that doth quicken thoſe that are dead in treſpaſſes and ſinnes. *Epheſ.*2.5. There is no more force in that place of *Deuteronomie*,

* Poteſtatem habens voluntatis ſuæ perficiendæ, *h. e.* quòd virgo conſentiat abſtinentiæ à conjugio. Si enim virgo diſſentiret, non haberet pater poteſtatem voluntatis propriæ perficiendæ. *Cajetan: ad loc.*

Bell de grat. & lib. arb. l. c. 23.

Non video quid ad hunc locum reſponderi poſſit. *Bell. de grat. et lib. arb. lib. 5. ca. 23.*

for proofe of *Free-will*, then in any other place of Scripture, which containeth in it precept, or exhortation. And indeed our adverſaries doe pretend, that all ſuch places are for them. And ſo did the *Pelagians* of old object ſuch places: but *Auſtine* anſwers them, that though it's true, *God doth not command man to doe that which cannot bee done by him, yet hee commandeth us to doe what wee are not able to doe* (viz. of our ſelves,) *that wee may ſeeke unto him to make us able.* Thus the people of God do; *Turne unto me*, ſaith God, *Joel* 2.12. *Turne thou us unto thee*, ſay the people of God, *Lam.* 5. 21. And by comparing places of Scripture together we may finde, that what God doth require of his people, the ſame hee doth promiſe unto them. *Waſh yee, make yee cleane*, ſaith he, *Iſai.*1.16. But *Ezek.*36. 25. *I will ſprinkle cleane water upon you* (ſaith hee) *and you ſhall be cleane.* So *Ezek.*18.31. God commands ſaying, *Make you a new heart, and a new ſpirit:* But *Ezek.*36.26. hee promiſeth this very thing, *A new heart alſo will I give you, and a new ſpirit will I put within you.* And accordingly *David* prayed unto God to worke this in him, *Create in me a clean heart O Lord, and renew a right ſpirit within me.* Pſal.51.10. And that of *Auſtine* is well known, *Give O Lord what thou doeſt command, and then command what thou willeſt.* Beſides, as *Bradwardine* obſerved long agoe, impotency and inability to performe a duty, proceeding from a mans own fault, doth nothing excuſe him either by the Law of God, or man. A bankrupt may juſtly be required to pay his debt, though hee be not able to pay it. Againe, Gods Precepts and Exhortations are not in vaine, though man by the power of his own Free-will be not able to doe what is required; becauſe God doth make thoſe very Precepts and Exhortations meanes whereby to worke that in his elect, which hee doth require of them. When Chriſt ſpake to *Lazarus* being dead and buried, ſaying, *Lazarus come forth*, Joh.11. this was not in vaine, though its certaine, a man that's dead, and laid in the grave, hath no power of himſelfe to come forth; yet (I ſay) it was not in vaine, that Chriſt ſpake

Bell.de grat. & lib. arbit. lib.5. cap. 18. *& lib. 6.cap.*10.

Magnum aliquid *Pelagiani* ſe ſcire putant, quando dicunt, non juberet Deus, quod ſciret non poſſe ab homine fieri. Quis hoc neſciat? Sed ideò jubet aliqua, quæ non poſſumus, ut noverimus quid ab illo petere debeamus. *Aug.de grat.& lib.arb.cap.*16.

Da Domine quod jubes, & jube quod vis.

Quis neſciat ſecundum omnia jura, Divina pariter & humana, impotentiam deſcendentem ex culpâ nullatenus excuſare, ſed forſan potius aggravare, &c. *Bradw. de Cauſa Dei lib.* 1. *cap.* 43.

ſo

ſo unto *Lazarus*; for together with his word hee ſent forth his Divine power, and ſo inabled *Lazarus* to come forth, as hee required. So neither is it in vaine, that God doth command men to doe things, which of themſelves they cannot doe, becauſe he accompanying his word with his ſpirit, inables them to do what hee commands. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you* (ſaith Chriſt) *the houre is comming, and now is, when the dead ſhall heare the voyce of the Son of God; and they that heare, ſhall live.* Joh.5.25. Our Saviour there ſpeakes of ſuch as are ſpiritually dead, as appeares thoſe words *and now is*, and he ſhewes, that his word is a powerfull and effectuall meanes (*viz.* by the concurrence of his ſpirit) to work the life of grace in them.

The third and laſt place of Scripture, which the Marqueſſe citeth for *Free-will*, is that *Mat.*23.37. *O Jeruſalem, Jeruſalem; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a Hen gathereth her Chickens under her wings, and yee would not.* But what doth this place prove? That men have *Free-Will* ſo farre forth, as of themſelves to reſiſt and reject the offers of grace; which wee nothing doubt of. But the queſtion is, whether men have ſuch a *Free-will*, as that of themſelves they can receive grace when it is offered. This is that which wee deny, neither doth the place alledged, make any thing for proofe of it.

The Marqueſſe ſaith, *There might have been a willingneſſe, as well as an unwillingneſſe*, (ſo it ſhould be, though it be printed, *as well as a willing*) *or elſe Chriſt had wept in vaine: and to thinke that he did ſo, were to make him an impoſtor.* I grant that there might have been a willingneſſe, but not by the power of *Free-will*, except made free by grace, it being God that doth worke both the will and the deed. *Phil.*2.13. So the Jewes, of whom Chriſt complained, that they would not come unto him, *Joh.*5.40. might have come; but yet of themſelves they could not come, not except it were given unto them of God, *Joh.*6.65. not except hee did draw them. *Joh.*6.44. Whereas the Marqueſſe ſpeakes of Chriſts weeping, his minde was (it ſeemes) upon another place, *viz.* that *Luk.*19.41,42. where it is ſaid, that Chriſt drawing nigh to *Ieruſalem*, beheld it, and *wept over it, ſaying, If thou hadſt known, even thou, at leaſt in this thy day, the things that belong unto thy peace: but now they are hid from thine eyes.*

But that Christ wept, when he said, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often would I have gathered thy children, &c.* this we do not find, though the words be recorded both *Mat.* 27. 37. and also *Luke* 13. 34.

But suppose that Christ had wept, when he said, *O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, &c.* yet had not his weeping been in vaine, though *Jerusalem* had no power of her selfe to doe that which there Christ speaks of. For yet nevertheless Christ shewed his affection towards *Jerusalem*, even as he did towards *Lazarus*, when he wept over him as he lay over the grave. *Behold how he loved him*, said the Jewes, *John* 11. 36. yet it is without all question, that *Lazarus* of himself could not have come out of the grave, except Christ by his Almighty power had raised him up. Some perhaps may say, But why did Christ complain of *Jerusalem* for her unwillingnesse, if it were not in her power to be willing? I answer, because both her unwillingnesse, and also her want of power to be willing was from her self; it was her own fault, and therefore she was justly complained of, and reproved for it.

But againe, some may say, *Jerusalem* had sufficient grace whereby she might have been willing, or else Christ would not have complained that she was unwilling. I answer, *Jerusalem* had a sufficiency of the means of Grace, which she ought to have made use of, and to have been wrought upon by, but would not, and therefore did Christ complain of her. But *Jerusalem* had not a sufficiency of the Spirit of Grace, without which she could not improve the means, as she should have done; and yet nevertheless, the complaint made of her was just: For God having given unto man, at first, Grace sufficient to doe whatsoever he should require, and this Grace being lost by mans own fault, *Eccles.* 7. 29. God is not bound to restore it but when, and where he pleaseth; and yet may justly require the obedience that is due unto him, and complain for want of it, as a man may justly demand his debt of a bankrupt, and complain of him for not paying it, though he be not able to pay it. * *Raimundus de Sabunde*, a Popish

* Homo non potest solvere, nec reddere Deo, quod debet Deo: quia non potest Deo reddere totum amorem suum, nec timorem, nec honorem, nec obedientiam, nec voluntatem Dei facere, quia corruptus est, & mutatus in contrarium suæ naturæ; & ipsemet fecit se talem, ut non possit Deo facere quod debet: & tamen semper debet: & si debitum semper manet, nec excusatur, quia tenetur: & si non potest, ipsemet est in causâ, & in culpâ quare non potest. *Raimund. de Sabund. Theolog. Natur. tit.* 250.

Author,

Author, is large in his expreſſions to this purpoſe, *That man being now corrupt, and made quite contrary to what he was at firſt, cannot pay that which he oweth unto God; cannot love, fear, honour, and obey God as he ought: and that yet nevertheleſſe the debt ſtill remaines, this is ſtill due unto God, and man is not excuſed, becauſe though he be not able, yet he himſelfe is the cauſe of his inability, and it is his owne fault that he is not able.*

After the allegation of theſe places of Scriptures, the Marqueſſe addes, that the Ancient Fathers are of their Opinion, *viz.* in point of Free-will, and he cites *Euſeb. Cæſar. de præp. l.* 1. *c.*7. *Hil. de Trinit. Aug. l.*1. *ad Simpl. q.* 4. *Ambr. in Luk.* 12. *Chryſ. hom.*19. *in Gen. Irenæus, l.* 4. *c.* 72. *Cyrill. in Joh. l.*4. *c.*7.

Now for diverſe of the Antient Fathers, and namely for *Auſtine*, (whom the Marqueſſe alledgeth againſt us, and who indeed is chiefly to be looked at in this Controverſie, as having moſt occaſion to declare himſelf in it, by reaſon of the Pelagian Hereſie which aroſe in his time) I have ſufficiently ſhewed before how far they are from compliance with our Adverſaries.

But to come to a particular examination of the Authors and places that are cited. Firſt *Euſebius*, in the place mentioned, hath nothing at all (that I can find) about Free-will, the whole Chapter being *de Phœnicum Theologiâ*, about the Divinity of the *Phœnicians*.

Hilary is ſo cited, that there is no looking after him; for he wrote twelve books of the Trinity, and here he is onely cited, *de Trin.* 1. of the Trinity, but in which of the twelve Books he ſaith any thing to this purpoſe, is not mentioned.

As for *Auſtine*, that which the Marqueſſe (I preſume) intended, is, *lib.*1. *ad Simplic. quæſt.* 2. not *q.*4. for there are but two Queſtions anſwered in the firſt Book; in the ſecond Book indeed there are more then four Queſtions, but nothing about Free-will. In the firſt Book, and ſecond Queſtion, there is ſomething that may ſeeme to make for the Opinion of the Marqueſſe, but much more is there, which doth indeed make againſt it; indeed, ſo much, that though *Bellarmine* cite diverſe paſſages out of *Auſtine* for proof of Free-will, yet he was more cautious (it ſeemes) then to cite any thing out of that which *Auſtine* wrote about it to *Simplicianus*.

Let us hear what *Auſtine* himſelf, in his Retractations (wherein he did review all his Works) ſaith concerning his books written to *Simplicianus*, and concerning that very Queſtion; in anſwer whereunto he hath much about Free-will: *In the ſolution of which queſtion* (ſaith he) *mans Free-will was much laboured for, but the Grace of God did overcome.* And this will clearly appear by peruſing the Book it ſelfe, and the queſtion handled in it. The queſtion is about the meaning of thoſe words, *Jacob have I loved, and Eſau have I hated*, and the reſt that follow, *Rom. 9.*

In cujus quæſtionis ſolutione laboratum eſt quidem pro libero arbitrio voluntatis humanæ, ſed vicit Dei gratia. *Aug. Retract. lib. 2. cap. 1.*

Noluit ergo Eſau, & non cucurrrit, ſed & ſi voluiſſet, & cucurriſſet, Dei adjutorio perveniſſet, qui ei etiam velle, & currere præſtaret, niſi vocatione contemptâ reprobus fieret. Aliter enim Deus præſtat ut velimus, aliter quod voluerimus. Ut velimus enim, & ſuum eſſe voluit, & noſtrum; ſuum vocando, noſtrum ſequendo. Quod autem voluerimus, ſolus præſtat, id eſt, poſſe benè agere, & ſemper beatè vivere. *Aug. ad Simplic. lib. 1. quæſt. 2.*

Now among other things that *Auſtine* ſaith, there is this, which (as I conceive) the Marqueſſe aimed at, *Eſau was not willing, and did not run; but if he had been willing, and had run, by the help of God he had obtained; God would have given him both to will, and to run, except by contemning Gods Call he would be a Reprobate. For God doth otherwiſe give us, that we may will, then he doth give us that which we have willed. For that we may will, God would have both to be his work, and ours: his by Calling, ours by Following when we are called. But that which we have willed, God alone doth give, that is, to be able to do well, and for ever to live happily.*

Here, I confeſſe, *Auſtine* doth ſeeme to ſhew himſelf a patron of Free-will, and we could not eaſily judge otherwiſe of him, if we ſhould look meerly upon theſe words, and take them as his poſitive ſentence. But if we conſider what *Auſtine* ſaith both before, and after, we ſhall ſee that he ſpake thus rather by way of objection, then by way of determination. Before theſe words he ſaith thus, *A wheel doth not therefore run well, that it may be round, but becauſe it is round. So no man doth therefore work well, that he may receive grace, but becauſe he hath received it.* *Auſtine* therefore was not of that minde, that *Eſau* of himſelf, by his free-will, could have been willing, and have run; or that any, when he is called, and incited by Grace, can by

Non ideò benè currit rota ut rotunda ſit, ſed quia rotunda eſt: ſic nemo propterea benè operatur, ut accipiat gratiam, ſed quia accepit. *Aug. Ibid.*

by the power of Free-will follow, and obey, but it is grace that muſt work this in him.

To this purpoſe againe before the words objected, *If (ſaith Auſtine) Jacob did therefore believe, becauſe he would, then God did not beſtow faith on him, but he by willing did afford it unto himſelf, and ſo he had ſomething which he received not.* Which is contrary to the words of the Apoſtle, *What haſt thou, that thou haſt not received?* 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. But a little after thoſe words that ſeeme to make for Free-will, *Auſtine* expreſſeth himſelf more fully: For having cited that of the Apoſtle, *Phil.* 2. 12,13. *Work out your own ſalvation with fear and trembling; for it is God that worketh in you, both to will, and to doe of his good pleaſure,* he addes, *The Apoſtle there ſufficiently ſhewes, that a good will it ſelf is wrought in us by God. For if therefore only it be ſaid,* (Rom. 9.) *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth mercy, becauſe the will of man alone is not ſufficient, that he may juſtly, and rightly, except it be helped by the mercy of God; then by this reaſon it may be ſaid, It is not of God that ſheweth mercy, but of man that willeth, becauſe the mercy of God alone is not ſufficient, unleſſe the conſent of our will be added. But that is manifeſt, that we will in vain, except God ſhew mercy. This I know not how it can be ſaid, that God doth ſhew mercy in vain, except we be willing. For if God ſhew mercy, then we are willing; ſeeing it belongs to that ſame mercy to make us willing. For it is God that worketh in us both to will, and to doe of his good pleaſure.*

Si ergò Jacob ideò credidit, quia voluit, non ei Deus donavit fidem, ſed eam ſibi ipſe volendo præſtitit, & habuit aliquid, quod non accepit. *Aug. Ibid.*

Ubi ſatis oſtendit etiam ipſam bonam voluntatem in nobis operante Deo fieri. Nam ſi propterea ſolùm dictum eſt, Non volentis, neque currentis, ſed miſerentis eſt Dei, quia voluntas hominis ſola non ſufficit, ut juſtè rectéq; vivatur, niſi adjuvetur miſericordiâ Dei; poteſt & hoc modo dici, Igitur non miſerentis eſt Dei, ſed volentis eſt hominis, quia miſericordia Dei ſola non ſufficit, niſi conſenſus noſtræ voluntatis addatur. At il ud manifeſtum eſt, fruſtrà nos velle, niſi Deus miſereatur. Illud neſcio quomodo dicatur, fruſtrà Deum miſereri, niſi nos velimus. Si enim Deus miſereatur, etiam volumus: ad eandem quippe miſericordiam pertinet, ut velimus. Deus enim eſt, qui operatur in nobis & velle, & operari prò bonâ voluntate. *Aug. Ibid.*

Again a little after, having ſaid by way of objection, *Free-will availeth much*; he anſwers, *Nay, it is indeed, but in thoſe, that are ſold under ſinne* (as all are till they be freed by Grace) *What doth it avail?*

Liberum voluntatis arbitrium plurimum valet: imò verò, eſt quidem, ſed in venundatis ſub peccato quid valet? *Aug Ibid.*

And

Cum ergò nos ea delectant, quibus proficiamus ad Deum, inſpiratur hoc, & præbetur gratiâ Dei, non nutu noſtro,& induſtriâ, aut operum meritis comparatur; quia ut ſit nutus voluntatis,ut ſit induſtria ſtudii,ut ſint opera charitate ferventia, ille tribuit, ille largitur. *Aug. Ibid.*

And againe, *When thoſe things delight us, whereby wee profit towards God, this is inſpired, and given unto us by the grace of God, it is not gotten by our conſent, induſtry, or the merits of our workes: becauſe the conſent of the will, the induſtry of indeavour, and workes fervent with charity,are all the gift of God.* Thus then it is moſt manifeſt, that in the place pointed at by the Marqueſſe, *Auſtine* was moſt farre from maintaining ſuch a *Free-will*, as we oppoſe. There is alſo a paſſage in *Auſtines* *ſecond book to *Simplicianus,quæſt.* 1. which may ſeeme to make againſt us,*viz. That to will any thing, is in the power of every one, but to be able to doe any thing, is not in the power of any.* But let *Auſtine* explain himſelf, and ſhew his own meaning;and that he doth in his Retractations; *That (ſaith hee) was ſpoken, becauſe we doe not ſay, that any thing is in our power, but that which is done when wee will. Where firſt, and chiefly is to will it ſelfe. For immediately without any diſtance of time the will it ſelfe is preſent, when wee will. But this power alſo to live well, wee receive from above, when the will is prepared of the Lord.* Thus carefull was that good Father to prevent the miſtaking of his words, leſt any ſhould thinke that hee did aſcribe any thing to the power of *Free-will*, in that which is good.

Quamvis ſit in cujuſque poteſtate quid velit, non eſt tamen in cujuſquam poteſtate quid poſſit. *Aug. lib. 2 ad Simpli. quæſt. 1.*

Quod ideò dictum eſt, quia non dicimus eſſe in poteſtate noſtrâ, niſi quod cum volumus, fit, ubi priùs, & maximè eſt ipſum velle. Sine ullo quippe intervallo temporis præſto eſt voluntas ipſa cum volumus: ſed hanc quoque ad benè vivendum deſuper accipimus poteſtatem, cum præparatur voluntas à Domino. *Aug. Retract. lib. 2. cap. 1.*

So much for *Auſtine*; the next Father alledged is *Ambroſe*, who in the place cited,*viz.* in *Luk.* 12. hath nothing above *Free-will*, that I can finde. After him followes *Chryſoſtome*, who indeed in the place, that is alledged, goes far in his expreſſions concerning *Free-will*, as if God onely did afford meanes, and ſo leave it in the power of man to uſe them, or not,as hee pleaſeth.

Quia ergo liberi arbitrii eſſe noſtram naturam fecit omnium Dominus, ipſe quidem, quæ ſua ſunt, omnia pro ſuâ miſericordiâ ſemper exhibet. —— Et neceſſitatem utique non imponit, ſed congruis remediis appoſitis totum jacere in ægrotantis ſententiâ dimittit. *Chryſoſt. Hom. 19. in Gen.*

If therefore I except againſt his teſtimony in this point, I have no meane men of the Church of *Rome* to beare mee out.

I

I know * *Bellarmine* ſeemes to take it as a matter of great advantage, that *Calvin* ſtands not here ſo much upon *Chryſoſtome*, as one that did too much extoll the power of *Free-will*. But was this onely *Calvines* judgement of *Chryſoſtome* ? Did not ſome of the Romaniſts themſelves alſo think thus of him ? † S. *Chryſoſtom* (ſaith *Alvarez* a Romiſh Archbiſhop, and a great Schooleman) *ſometimes doth wonderfully extoll the power of our* Free-will, *ſpeaking as it were hyperbolically, whiles hee ſtrives to impugne the errors of the Manichees, and of the Gentiles, who held that Man is ſtill by nature* (as hee was firſt created of God) *or that by the violence of fate he is compelled to ſinne.* So alſo *Janſenius* (a Romiſh Biſhop, to whom alſo *Alvarez* doth referre us) haveing mentioned ſomething of *Euthymius*, and *Theophylact*, hee ſaith, that thoſe paſſages were taken from *Chryſoſtome*, and that *except they be warily read, and underſtood, they may give occaſion of falling into the error of* Pelagius, *who held that the beginning of faith, and juſtification is from our ſelves, and the conſummation from God*, &c. *Chryſoſtome* (he ſaith) *meant well concerning the grace of God, yet he wrote many things againſt the Manichees in commendation of* Free-will, *attributing moſt things unto it without making any mention of Gods Grace; which things he would not have written in that manner, if hee could have foreſeene that* Pelagius *his hereſie would ariſe, which as then was not riſen, or not known unto men.* Thus wee ſee how theſe Authors, though they excuſe *Chryſoſtomes* meaning, yet diſlike his expreſſion. But ſome amongſt thoſe of the Roman Church have gone further in their cenſure of *Chryſoſtome*, as * *Alvarez*

*Hunc patrem nobis *Calvinus* libenter concedit, quòd ei iminus viſus ſit in liberi arbitrii viribus prædicandis. At imperitiam ſuam operè prodit, &c. *Bell. de grat. et lib. arb. l. 5. c. 25.*

† S. *Chryſoſtomus* nonnunquam vires noſtri liberi arbitrii mirum in modum extollit, loquendo quaſi per hyperbolen ex contentione impugnandi Manicheorum, & gentilium errores &c. *Alvar. de auxil. diſp. 22. Sect. 33.*

Quæ dicta à *Chryſoſtomi* locutione in variis locis ferè deſumpta, niſi cautè legantur, & intelligantur, præbere poſſunt occaſionem erroris Pelagii, qui aſſeruit initium fidei, & juſtificationis eſſe ex nobis, conſummationem verò ex Deo, &c. *Chryſoſtomus* ſanè optimè ſentiens de Dei gratiâ, &c. tamen multa ſcripſit contra Manichæum in commendationem liberi arbitrii, pleraque illi tribuens ſine commemoratione gratiæ Divinæ, quæ non ſic ſcripſiſſet, ſi prævidere potuiſſet exorituram Pelagii hæreſin, quæ tum adhuc non erat exorta, vel illi cognita. *Janſen. Concord. cap. 59.*

* Quidam reſpondent, &c. *Chryſoſtomum*, cum intelligere non valeret, quanam ratione libertas arbitrii noſtri ſalva poſſet conſiſtere, ſi Deus ſuâ gratiâ noſtram præveniret electionem, credidiſſe, electionem, quâ primò accepimus bona, eáque facere decernimus, eſſe priorem ipſâ Dei gratiâ, poſteà verò ſubſequi gratiam, quâ adjuvamur, & nobis coöperatur Deus. *Alvar. loc citat.*

relates, *viz.* that he held, *that election, whereby we first accept those things, that are good, and resolve to doe them, is before the grace of God, and that then grace doth follow after, whereby we are helped, and God doth co-operate with us.* To this purpose I finde *Tolet*, a Jesuite first, and afterwards a Cardinall, cited by *Chamier*, though I have not his Booke now at hand to peruse. And this may suffice for answer to *Chrysostome*, yea and to those other two Fathers also, that follow, *viz. Irenæus* and *Cyrill*, the latter of these being by name, and both of them implicitly excepted against by some of the Romanists themselves, as appeares by what is cited in the margent, as also by the reasons alledged by *Alvarez*, and *Iansenius*, why *Chrysostome* did exceede at least in his expressions, *viz.* because he was so earnest against the Manichees and others, and knew nothing of the contrary errour of the *Pelagians*, which reasons might transport the other Fathers also. *It is true* (saith *Alvarez*) *that S.* Chrysostome, *and other Fathers, that wrote before the Heresie of* Pelagius *was risen up, did speake little of the grace of Christ, and much for the confirming of the liberty of the will against the heresie of the Manichees.* He addes that *Austine* also in his writings against the *Pelagians* did observe this, and hee cites his words to this purpose. Yea, hee shewes that *Austine* in his Retractations was faine to answer in like manner for himself, when as the *Pelagians* did make use of his former writings against the Manichees, thereby to maintaine their opinion concerning the power of *Free-Will* in opposition to the necessity and efficacy of Gods Grace. Thus likewise *Jansenius* saith, that *after the* Pelagian *heresie was risen, then* Austine *spake more exactly, and more expresly of the Grace of God.* The Jesuit * *Maldonate* doth tell us, that *Ammonius*, and *Cyrill*, *Theophylact*, *Cyrillus*, *Theophylactus*, & *Euthymius*, respondent non omnes trahi, quia non omnes digni sunt. Quod nimis affine est *Pelagianorum* errori. Quasi verò homo antequam per gratiam ad gratiam trahatur, mereri possit gratiâ, quod est dignum fieri, qui trahatur. *Maldon. in Ioh. 6. 44.*

Toletus in *Joh. 6.* agnoscit *Chrysostomi* hanc esse sententiam, hominem per liberum arbitrium seipsum facere dignum gratiâ; eandem esse *Cyrilli*, aliorum etiam doctorum, maximè Græcorum. *Cham. tom. 3. l. 3. c. 16. Sect. 11.*

Verum est, quòd S. *Chrysostomus*, & alii Patres qui ante exortam hæresin *Pelagii* scripserunt, pauca de gratiâ Christi, & plurima pro confirmandâ arbitrii libertate contra hæresin Manichæorum docuerunt, quod & S. *Augustinus* advertit, &c. *Alvar. disp. 22. Sect. 22.*

Itaque *Augustinus* exortâ jam hæresi *Pelagianâ*, exactiùs & expressiùs locutus est de Dei gratiâ, &c. *Jansen. concord. cap. 59.*

* *Ammonius*,

and

and *Euthymius* ſo expound that, *No man commeth unto me except the Father draw him*, that they come too nigh the error of *Pelagius*, viz. that all are not drawn, becauſe all are not worthy, *as if* (ſaith he) *before a man be drawn by grace unto grace, hee could deſerve grace, which is to be worthy to be drawn.*

But though *Irenæus*, and *Cyrill* be liable to theſe exceptions, yet I ſee nothing in the places cited by the Marqueſſe, wherein they make againſt us. *Irenæus* ſaith thus, *If it were not in us to doe theſe things, or not to do them, why did the Apoſtle, and before him the Lord himſelf counſell us to doe ſome things, and to abſtaine from other things?* Here *Irenæus* indeed ſheweth that it is in us to doe, or not to doe, but hee doth not ſay that it is *in nobis ex nobis*, in us of our ſelves, by the power of our *Free-will* to doe things truly good. He addes immediately, that *man from the beginning is free, as God, after whoſe likeneſſe hee was made, is free.* Now this doth rather make againſt our adverſaries then for them; for it ſhewes, that the freedome of mans will doth not conſiſt in this, that hee is free either to doe good, or to doe evill, ſeeing that God is not free in that manner, hee being onely free to doe good, but altogether uncapable of doing evill. So man being determined by grace to that, which is good, yet is free, becauſe not conſtrained nor forced againſt his will, in the doing of it: and ſo on the other ſide hee is free in doing evill, though of himſelfe without grace he can doe nothing but evill. As for the other Fathers, *viz. Cyrill*, that which hee ſaith in the place alledged, is this, *Wee cannot according to the doctrine of the Church, and of the truth, by any meanes deny the free power of man, wich is called* Free-will. This is nothing againſt us, who doe not (as hath beene ſhewed before) ſimply deny *Free-will*, but onely ſo as our adverſaries of the Church of *Rome* doe maintaine it. To that which is in controverſie betwixt us, and our adverſaries, *Cyrill* here ſaith nothing, and therefore his

Si igitur non in nobis eſſet facere hæc, aut non facere, quam cauſam habebat Apoſtolus, & multo priùs ipſe Dominus conſilium dare, quædam quidem facere, à quibuſdam verò abſtinere? *Iren. lib. 4. cap. 72.*

Sed quoniam liberæ ſententiæ ab initio eſt homo, & liberæ ſententiæ eſt Deus, ad cujus ſimilitudinem factus eſt, ſemper conſilium datur ei continere bonum, &c. *Ibid.*

Non poſſumus ſecundum Eccleſiæ veritatiſque dogmata, liberam poteſtatem hominis, quod liberum arbitrium appellatur, ullo modo negare. *Cyr. in Ioh. l. 4. c. 7.*

teſtimony is not to the purpoſe. And ſo much for *Free-will.*

Page 65. In the next place, *We hold it poſſible* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *to keepe the Commandements; you ſay it is impoſſible. Wee have Scripture for it.* Luke 1.6. *And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the Commandements, and Ordinances of the Lord, blameleſſe. And* 1 Joh.5.3. *His Commandements are not grievous.*

For keeping the Commandements we hold, not that it is ſimply impoſſible, but that according to that meaſure of grace, which God doth ordinarily beſtow upon men here in this life, it is not poſſible to keep them, *viz.* ſo as not to be guilty of the breach of them. If a man could fully and perfectly keep the Commandements, then he ſhould be without ſin; for ſinne is nothing elſe but a tranſgreſſion of the Law, as Saint *John* defines it, 1 *John* 3.4. But the Scripture ſhewes that no man in this life is ſo perfect as to be without ſinne. *There is not a juſt man upon earth that doth good, and ſinneth not,* ſaith *Solomon,* Eccleſ. 7. 20. *If we ſay that we have no ſinne, We deceive our ſelves, and the truth is not in us,* ſaith Saint *John,* 1 John 1. 8. *In many things We offend all,* ſaith Saint *James, Jam.* 3. 2. And Chriſt hath taught all to pray for forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, *Mat.* 6. 12. which ſuppoſeth that all, even the beſt that live upon earth, have need of it, that they are guilty of ſinnes, and ſo conſequently come ſhort of the full, and perfect keeping of Gods Commandements. *Bellarmine* thinks to elude theſe places, by ſaying, *That we cannot indeed live without Veniall ſinnes, but that Veniall ſinnes are not ſinnes ſimply, but onely imperfectly, and in ſome reſpect; and that they are not againſt the Law, but only beſides it.*

Solida reſponſio eſt, peccata venialia, ſine quibus non vivimus, non eſſe peccata ſimpliciter, ſed imperfectè, & ſecundum quid, neque eſſe contra legem, ſed præter legem, &c. *Bell. de Iuſtif. lib.* 4 *cap.* 14.

But firſt, Veniall ſinnes are againſt the Law, as being tranſgreſſions of it; for elſe they are no ſinnes at all, that being the very nature of ſinne, to be a tranſgreſſion of the Law, 1 *John* 3.4.

2. There are no ſins ſo veniall, but that without the mercy of God in Chriſt they are damnable. It being written, *Curſed is every one that continueth not in all things, that are written in the book of the Law to doe them,* Gal.3.10.

And thirdly, no man living upon earth is free from ſuch ſinnes,

as

as that he is able to ſtand, if God ſhall enter into judgement with him. *If thou Lord ſhouldeſt mark iniquities, O Lord who ſhall ſtand?* Pſal. 130. 3. *Enter not into judgement with thy ſervant; for in thy ſight ſhall no man living be juſtified,* Pſal. 143. 2.

The Fathers here are on our ſide; *Hierome* having cited that of our Saviour, *Out of the hearts of men proceed evill thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetouſneſſe, &c.* addes, *Let him come forth, that can teſtifie that theſe things are not in his heart, and I will confeſſe that full and perfect righteouſneſſe may be in this mortall body. Who is there* (ſaith *Leo*) *ſo free from fault, that there is not in him that, which either juſtice may condemne, or mercy may pardon? In no thing to ſinne, is proper unto God,* ſaith *Ambroſe.* He means that no man in this life can attain unto that perfection; for ſo he addes preſently after, *He that bears about him fleſh* (a mortall body) *is ſubject unto ſinne.*

Procedat, quì in corde ſuo hæc non eſſe teſtetur, & plenam in corpore iſto mortali juſtitiam confitebor. *Hier. dial. adverſ. Pelag. l. 2.*

Quis invenitur ita immunis à culpâ, ut in eo non habeat vel juſtitia quod arguat, vel miſericordia quod remittat? *Leo Ser. 7. de ſolen. Epiphan.*

Nihil peccare, ſolius eſt Dei.——Qui carnem gerit, culpæ obnoxius eſt. *Ambroſ. lib. 1. Epiſt. 3.*

Thus alſo *Auſtine*, *Who is there* (ſaith he) *in this life ſo clean, but that he hath need to be made yet more and more clean?* And again, *The Church* (ſaith he) *in this life is ſo cleanſed, not that they that are juſtified have no mainders of ſinne in them, but that they have not any ſpot of criminall offence, nor any wrinkle of falſhood.* Accordingly ſpeaks *Gregory*, *In this life* (ſaith hee) *many are without criminall offences, but none can bee without ſinne.* And preſently after hee ſayes, that theſe ſinnes, which none can be without, doe pollute the ſoule, though they doe not deſtroy it. *Bernard* interprets that of Saint *John*, *He that is born of God. ſinneth not*, 1 *John* 3. 9. thus, *He ſinneth not, that is, he doth not continue in ſinne.* Or thus, *He ſinneth not, that is, it is as much as if he did not ſinne, becauſe ſinne is not imputed unto him.*

Quis eſt in hâc vitâ ſic mundus, ut non ſit magis magiſque mundandus? *Aug. tract. 80. in Ioh.*

Sic mundatur Eccleſia in hâc vitâ, non ut juſtificati nullas in ſe habeant peccati reliquias, ſed ut maculam criminis, & rugam non habeant falſitatis. *Aug. contra Iul. l. 4. c. 3.*

In hâc vitâ multi ſine crimine, nullus verò eſſe ſine peccato valet.——Nonnulla peccata animam polluunt, quam crimina extinguunt. *Greg in Iob. lib. 21. cap. 10.*

Non peccat, id eſt, non permanet in peccato.——Sive non peccat, id eſt, tantundem eſt, ac ſi non peccet, pro eo ſcilicet quod non imputatur ei peccatum. *Bern. in Septuageſ. Ser. 1.*

Nec latuit præceptorem, præcepti pondus hominum excedere vires, sed judicavit utile ex hoc ipso suæ illos insufficientiæ admoneri, & ut scirent sanè ad quem justitiæ finem niti pro viribus oporteret. Ergo mandando impossibilia non prævaricatores homines fecit, sed humiles, ut omne os obstruatur, & subditus fiat omnis mundus Deo, quia ex operibus legis non justificabitur omnis caro coram illo. Accipientes quippe mandatum, & sentientes defectum clamabimus in cœlum, & miserebitur nostri Deus; & sciemus in illo die, quia non ex operibus justitiæ quæ fecimus nos, sed secundum suam misericordiam salvos nos fecit. *Bern. in Cant. Ser.* 50.

him. And elsewhere he expressely yeeldeth that Gods Commandements are more then any can fully and perfectly observe. *The Commander* (saith he) *was not ignorant, that the command did exceede mens strength, but he judged it profitable, that they should be admonished of their insufficiency, and that they should know, to What perfection of righteousnesse they ought to endeavour as they are able; Therefore by commanding things impossible, he did not make men prevaricatours, but humble, that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be subject unto God: because by the Workes of the Law shall no flesh be justified before him. For receiving the Commanment, and feeling a defect, wee shall cry towards Heaven, and God will have mercy on us; and we shall know in that day, that not by the Workes of righteousnesse that we have done, but according to his mercy he hath saved us.*

Thus also some of the Church of *Rome*, that have written since *Luthers* time, have acknowledged, that none in this life are free from sinne, nor able to abide the judgement of God by their own righteousnesse, which is in effect to acknowledge that none doe perfectly keepe Gods Commandements. Thus * *Ferus* speaking of such as are justified, saith that *they have indeed yet many sinnes, but no condemnation, because they are reputed clean for their faith in Christ.* † And againe, *No man* (saith hee) *how holy soever, is free from sin, so long as hee lives in this World. Therefore all have need to be purged daily.* So also * *Genebrard, Seeing* (saith hee) *that none is perfectly righteous before God, the fear of his just and pure judgement ought to affright all.* That is his comment upon the words of *David, Enter not into judgement with thy servant O Lord, &c.* Psal. 143. 2. Now for those two places of Scripture, which the Marquesse

* Multum quidem peccatorum habent adhuc, sed nihil damnationis, quia apud Deum mundi reputantur propter fidem in Christum. *Ferus in Iob.* 13. 10.

† Nemo enim quantumvis sanctus, immunis est à peccato, quamdiù vivit in hoc seculo. ——Opus igitur habent quotidianâ purgatione. *Ferus in Iob.* 15. 2.

* Quare cum nemo sit perfectè justus apud Deum, justi & puri judicii metus omnes terrere debet. *Genebr. in Psa.* 142. (*vel.* 143) 2.

queſſe alledgeth, they come farre ſhort of proving that poſſibility of keeping Gods Commandements, which wee deny. As for that *Luk.*1.6. it ſhewes indeed that *Zacharias* and *Elizabeth* had reſpect unto all Gods Commandements as all ought to have, *Pſal.*119.6. but it doth not ſhew, that they did perfectly keepe all Gods Commandements. *Hierome* long agoe anſwered the *Pelagians* objecting theſe very perſons, and others ſpoken of in Scripture as righteous, that *they are called righteous, not that they were without fault, but becauſe they were for moſt part vertuous.* And I marvell how any can alledge the example of *Zacharias*, as one that did perfectly keep the Commandements, (though I know *Bellarmine* to this purpoſe doth alledge it) when as in that very Chapter, *viz.Luk.*1. is related how hee ſinned in not believing the meſſage, which by an Angell God ſent unto him, and how hee was puniſhed, and became dumbe a long time for it. The other place, *viz.*1 *Joh.*5.3. only ſhews that the Children of God do willingly and chearfully obey the will of God, not that they doe fully and perfectly obey it. *I have rejoyced in the way of thy teſtimonies*, ſaith *David*, Pſal.119.14. *I will delight my ſelfe in thy ſtatutes.* v.16. *The Law of thy mouth is better unto me then thouſands of gold and ſilver.* v.72. *How ſweet are thy words unto my taſte? yea ſweeter then hony to my mouth.* v.103. *More to be deſired are they then gold, yea then much fine gold; ſweeter alſo then Hony, and the Hony combe*, Pſal.19.10. yet preſently hee addes, *Who can underſtand his errours? cleanſe thou me from ſecret faults.* verſ.12. And elſewhere hee complaines, ſaying, *Mine iniquities have taken hold upon me, ſo that I am not able to looke up: they are more then the haires of my head.* Pſal.40.12. And againe, *Iniquities prevaile againſt me.* Pſal.65.3. And (as before noted) hee cryes out, *Enter not into judgement with thy ſervant, &c.* Pſal. 143. 2. The Hiſtory of his life recorded in Scriptures evidently ſhewes, that though Gods Commandements were as little grievous unto him, as to any, yet hee came ſhort of a full and perfect obſervance of them.

Juſti appellantur, non quòd omni vitio careant, ſed quòd majori parte virtutum commendentur. *Hieron. adv. Pelagian. ad Ctesiphont.*

Bell. de Juſtific. lib.4.cap. 11.

The Marqueſſe addes, *The Fathers are for us. Orig. Hom.9. in Joſ. S.Cyrill lib.4.contra Julian. S. Hil.in* Pſal.118. *S.Hieron. lib.*

lib. 3. contra Pelag. S. Basil. But I have shewed already what little cause our adversaries have in this point to boast of the Fathers, and that both *Hierome*, whom the Marquesse here citeth, and also diverse others assert the same that wee doe. To those before mentioned I may adde another of these here alledged against us, *viz.* † *Hilarie*, who in *Psal.* 118. saith that *none living is without sinne, onely one* (viz. Christ) *did no sinne, neither was guile found in his mouth.*

† Propheta in corpore positus loquitur, & neminem viventium scit sine peccato esse posse. Unum meminisse, qui peccatum non fecit, neque dolus inventus est in ore ejus. *Hil. in Ps.* 118. *vel* 119. *v.* 39.

Therefore whenas * *Hilarie* saith upon those words Psalme 119. 96. *thy Commandement is exceeding broad*, that *it is no hard matter, if will be present, to obey Gods Commandement*: hee speakes of such an obedience, not which is every way compleat and perfect, (for then it should be easie to live without sinne) but which God will accept, as hee will that which is sincere, though it be imperfect. Otherwise even upon those very words * *Hilarie* sheweth that man cannot perfectly obey Gods Commanments, saying, that *they are so broad, that they infinitely exceede the shallownesse of mans knowledge.* If mans knowledge cannot reach to the full extent of Gods Commandements, much lesse can his practice doe it. So that which *Hierome* saith, though it may seeme to be against us, yet indeed it is not. *God* (saith he) *hath commanded things possible.* (So the Pelagian objected, hee answers) *this none doubts of.* Hee grants it; but how? No otherwise, for any thing I can see, then as wee doe grant it, *viz.* that God, if he please can give such a measure of grace unto men, as to inable them perfectly to doe all that is commanded.

* Latum igitur mandatum Dei est, &c. ut non difficile sit, si voluntas adsit, præcepto Dei obtemperare, *Hil. in Psal.* 118. (*vel.* 119.) 96.

* Latum planè est (mandatum) quòd in infinitum cognitionem humanæ ignorantiæ excedit. *Hil. Ibid.*

Deus possibilia mandavit; hoc nulli dubium est. *Hier. adverf. Pelag. l.* 3.

But * *Hierome* immediately after shewes, that none either doth, or ever did so, and that therefore all are guilty before God, and stand in neede of his mercy. *If* (saith hee) *thou canst*

* Sed quia homines possibilia non faciunt, iccircò omnis mundus subditus est Deo, & indiget misericordiâ ejus; aut certè si ostendere poteris, qui universa compleverit, tunc poteris demonstrare esse hominem, qui non indiget misericordiâ Dei.---Monstra factum esse de præterito, aut certè nunc fieri. *Hier. Ibid.*

shew

ſhew any, that hath fulfilled all things required then thou canſt ſhew one that doth not needs Gods mercy, ſhew that this hath been, or that it now is. So when *Cyrill* ſaith that even that precept, *Thou ſhalt not covet*, may be fulfilled by grace, hee doth not oppoſe us, nor wee him. For wee doubt not but God is able to give grace whereby to fulfill it; but wee deny that any (onely Chriſt excepted) ever had ſuch grace as whereby to fulfill it. *Baſil* is cited at large, no place being noted where he ſaith any thing about this point; onely in *Bellarmine* I finde that upon thoſe words *Take heed to thy ſelfe* hee ſaith, that it is a wicked thing to ſay that the precepts of the Spirit are impoſſible. Which wee yeeld; ſo farre forth as any have the Spirit, they may performe them: but none have the Spirit in ſuch full meaſure as to be able fully to performe whatſoever is commanded. *Origen* in the place cited, compares them to Women, who ſay that they cannot keepe Gods Commandements. Which muſt be underſtood of keeping them ſo as to have reſpect unto them, and to ſtudy and indeavour to keepe them. For otherwiſe if we ſpeake of an exact and perfect keeping of the Commandements, both men and women, even the beſt upon Earth, are farre from it. *For the fleſh luſteth againſt the ſpirit*, (ſaith the Apoſtle) *and the ſpirit againſt the fleſh, and theſe are contrary the one to the other, ſo that you cannot do the things that you would.* Gal. 5. 17.

Bell. de Juſtifi. lib. 4. cap. 12.

Wee hold (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *faith cannot juſtifie without workes. Wee ſay, good workes are not abſolutely neceſſary unto ſalvation. Wee have Scripture for what wee ſay.* 1 Cor. 13. 2. *Though I have all Faith, and have no Charity, I am nothing. And* James 2. 24 *By Workes a Man is juſtified, and not by Faith onely.*

Page 65.

Anſw. Proteſtants in oppoſition to them of the Church of *Rome* hold that Faith alone doth juſtifie, and that Workes doe not concurre with Faith unto juſtification. Yet withall they hold that Faith which doth juſtifie, is not alone without workes. * *Bellarmine* confeſſeth that *Calvin* hath theſe very words,

* Jo. Calvinus in Antidoto Concilii ad can. 11. Seſſ. 6.

Sola, inquit, fides eſt quæ juſtificat, ſed fides tamen quæ juſtificat, non eſt ſola. Sicut calor ſolis ſolus eſt, qui terram calefacit, ipſe tamen calor non eſt ſolus in ſole, ſed cum ſplendore. Idem docent Philippus tum in locis, tum in Apologiâ confeſſ. Brentius in Catechiſmo, Chemnitius in Exam. Concilii, & alii. *Bell de juſtif lib. 1. cap. 14.*

It is Faith alone that doth justifie, but yet Faith which doth justifie, is not alone. As the heate of the Sun alone is that which doth heate the Earth, yet heate is not alone in the Sun, but there is light also joyned with it. And hee addes that *Melanchon, Brentius, Chemnitius,* and other Protestants teach the same thing.

Therefore by *Bellarmines* owne confession Protestants are no enemies unto good workes. Neither are they any whit injurious unto them in excluding them from having a share in justification, as the Romanists are injurious unto Faith in making workes copartners with it in that respect. *We conclude* (saith S. *Paul*) *That a Man is justified by Faith, without the deeds of the Law.* *Rom.*3.28. And in the next Chapter the Apostle proves by the example of *Abraham* that justification is by Faith without Workes. *For what saith the Scripture,* Abraham *believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousnesse.* Rom.4.3. He confirmes it also by the words of *David*; *Even as* David *also describes the blessednesse of the man, to whom God imputeth righteousnesse without Workes, saying, blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven,* &c. Rom.4. 6, 7, 8. Mens workes are imperfect, and so is all that righteousnesse of man, that is inherent in him, as hath been shewed before: and therefore by his own workes, and his own righteousnesse can none be justified. *By the deeds of the Law shall no flesh be justified.* Rom.3.20. *Bellarmine* would have the Apostle, when hee excludes Workes from justification, onely to understand such workes as are done by the meere knowledge of the Law without grace. But this cannot be his meaning.

Bell. de Justif. lib.1.cap.19.

For, 1. when *David* cried out, *Enter not into judgement with thy servant, O Lord, for in thy sight shall no man living be justified,* Psal.143.2. hee shewes that workes, whatsoever they be, are unable to justifie a man in the sight of God. For it were most absurd and irrationall to imagine that *David* then doth onely deprecate Gods entring into judgement with him in respect of the Works, which hee did without the assistance of Gods grace.

2. The Apostle proves that justification is by Faith without Workes, by that of *David, Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sinnes are covered: Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sinne.* Rom.4.6,7,8. *Now the best man that*

that is upon Earth, hath need of this; that his iniquities may be forgiven, his sinnes covered, and his transgressions not imputed unto him, seeing there is no man (as I have shewed before) but iniquities, sinnes and transgressions are found in him. Therefore though a man be regenerate and sanctified, yet his workes are not such, as that he can be justified by them.

3. The Apostle *Gal.*3.10. proves that none can be justified by the deeds of the Law, because it is written, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the booke of the Law to doe them.* Now no man though indued with grace, and that in great measure, doth continue in all things that the Law requireth, as hath also been shewed before. Therefore Workes as well with grace, as without grace are unable to justifie. But when our adversaries speake of justification, they equivocate, making it indeed the same with sanctification. * *Durens* the Jesuite calles this new Divinity, to say, that by grace infused into us, wee get newnesse of life, and sanctification, but yet are not thereby justified. And hee askes what Scripture doth teach us to distinguish justification from sanctification. Truly, I thinke that these two, *viz*, justification and sanctification, are sufficiently distinguished, 1 *Cor.*6.11. *But you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified, in the Name of the Lord Iesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* There the Apostle shews that they were washed, *viz.* both from the staine of sinne by sanctification, which was wrought in them by the Spirit of God infusing grace into them, and also from the guilt of sinne by justification, which they obtained by faith in the Lord Jesus.

*Nova hæc, *Whitakere*, theologia est, nos per gratiam infusam, vitæ novitatem, ac sanctitatem adipisci, minimè tamen justificari. At quæ te, obsecro, Scriptura docuit justificationem à sanctificatione distinguere? *Dur. contra Whitak.*

Besides, the Scripture opposeth justification to condemnation, and sheweth that to justifie is as much as to absolve and acquit from guilt, to account and pronounce righteous. *Prov.*17.15. *He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just; even they both are an abomination to the Lord.* There to justifie and to condemne are opposed one to the other; and to justifie is to repute just, not to make just; for so it should be an abomination to justifie the wicked, but a very good worke. *For hee which converteth a sinner from the errour of his way, shall save a*

ſoule from death,&c. Iames 5.20. So *Iſai.*5. 23. They are taxed, *who juſtifie the wicked for a reward.* Thus alſo God is ſaid to juſtifie, Iſai.50.8. *Hee is neare that juſtifieth mee, who will contend with me?* And Rom.8.33,34. *who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of Gods elect? it is God that juſtifieth. Who is he that condemneth? it is Chriſt that died, &c.* But (ſaith * *Bellarmine*) when God doth juſtifie the wicked, by declaring him juſt, he doth alſo make him juſt: becauſe the judgement of God is according to truth. I anſwer, true it is, whom God doth juſtifie them alſo hee doth ſanctifie, yet it doth not follow that theſe two, *viz.* to juſtifie, and to ſanctifie are one and the ſame. *David* was a man truly ſanctified, yet hee knew and acknowledged that his righteouſneſſe, whereby hee was ſanctified, was not ſuch, as that he could be juſtified by it, and therefore cried, *Enter not into judgement with thy ſervant, &c. Pſal.*143.2. And, *Bleſſed is the man whoſe iniquity is forgiven, &c.* Pſal.32.1,2. yet is Gods judgement nevertheleſſe according to truth, when hee accounteth thoſe righteous, and imputeth no ſinne unto them, who ſtill have ſinne in them, and ſo cannot be juſtified by their owne righteouſneſſe, becauſe they whom God juſtifieth, by faith are united unto Chriſt, as members of his Body, and ſo Chriſts righteouſneſſe is their righteouſneſſe, and though not in themſelves, yet in Chriſt they are compleatly righteous. He is called *The Lord our righteouſneſſe. Ier.*23.6. And ſayes the Apoſtle, *In him yee are complete.* Col.2.10. wherefore hee deſired *to be found in him, not having his own righteouſneſſe, which is of the Law, but that which is through the faith of Chriſt*, the righteouſneſſe, which is of God by faith. *Phil.*3.9. And thus we hold that faith doth juſtifie, not formally, but inſtrumentally, not becauſe of it ſelfe, but becauſe of its object, *viz.* Chriſt and his righteouſneſſe, which faith apprehendeth and applieth. For by faith wee receive Chriſt. *Ioh.*1.12. And Chriſt doth dwell in our hearts by faith. *Epheſ.*3.17. Diverſe of the Church of *Rome* ſince the beginning of Reformation, in this great point touching juſtification have inclined to us. *Ferus* I cited before, ſaying that *Believers have yet much ſinne, but no condemnation, becauſe thorough faith in Chriſt they are reputed cleane.* Cardinall *Con-*

Page 136.

* Quando Deus juſtificat impium, declarando juſtum, facit etiam juſtum, quoniam judicium Dei ſecundum veritatem eſt. *Bell. de Iuſtif. l.*2.*c.*3.

tarenus his workes I have not, neither can I alledge him of mine own knowledge, but his words as I finde them cited by * another, are very full for our purpoſe. *Becauſe* (ſaith hee) *wee come unto a twofold righteouſneſſe by faith, a righteouſneſſe inherent in us, &c. and the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt given, and imputed to us, in that wee are ingraffed into Chriſt, and put on Chriſt, it remaines to inquire, Whether of theſe we muſt rely upon, that wee may be juſtified before God, that is accounted holy and juſt. I doe altogether hold, that it is piouſly and Chriſtianly ſaid, that wee ought to rely, as on a thing that is ſtable, and doth ſurely ſupport us, on the righteouſneſſe of Chriſt given unto us, and not on that holineſſe and grace, which is inherent in us. For this righteouſneſſe of ours is but inchoated and imperfect; Which cannot preſerve us ſo, but that in many things We offend, and ſinne continually. Therefore for this righteouſneſſe of ours wee cannot be accounted righteous and good in the ſight of God, ſo as it ſhould become the ſonnes of God to be good and holy. But the righteouſneſs of Chriſt given unto us is true and perfect righteouſneſſe, which doth altogether pleaſe the eyes of God, in which there is nothing that may offend God, nothing which cannot fully pleaſe him. On this therefore alone, as ſure and ſtable, muſt we rely, and for it alone muſt wee believe that Wee are juſtified before God, that is, accounted and called iuſt.* I ſee not why we ſhould deſire more in point of juſtification then this amounts to. *Pighius* alſo a ſtout Champion of the Church of *Rome*, is as full and expreſſe for that, which wee make the formall cauſe of juſtification, as any can be. *It is cleare* (ſaith hee) *What ſentence we ſhould all have, if God would have dealt With us in ſtrict judgement: if hee had not moſt mercifully ſuccoured us in his Son, and had not involved and Wrapped us in his righteouſneſſe, wee having none of our own that Will ſerve our turne.* And againe, *In him therefore are Wee juſtified, not in our ſelves; not with our own, but with his righteouſneſſe, which by reaſon of our communion With Him is imputed unto us. Being empty of our owne righteouſneſſe wee are taught to ſeeke righte-*

* *Ameſius* againſt *Bellarmine lib. 6. de Iuſtif. cap. 1. Theſſ. 1.*

Conſtat planè quæ de nobis omnibus foret ſententia, ſi Deus voluiſſet diſtricto nobiſcum judicio agere: ſi non miſericordiſſimè nobis ſuccurriſſet in filio, & noſtrâ juſtitiâ vacuos ejus involviſſet juſtitiâ. *Pigh. de fide & juſtifi. controv. 2.*

In illo ergo juſtificamur coram Deo, non in nobis; non noſtrâ, ſed illius juſtitiâ, quæ nobis cum illo communicantibus imputatur. Propriæ juſtitiæ inopes, extra nos in illo docemur juſtitiam quærere. *Pigh. Ibid.*

ouſneſſe

† In Christi autem obedientiâ, quòd nostra collocatur justitia, inde est, quòd nobis illi incorporatis, ac si nostra esset, accepta ea fertur, ita ut eâ ipsâ etiam nos justi habeamur.

ousnesse out of our selves in him. † And againe, *That our righteousnesse is placed in Christs obedience, it is from hence, that wee being incorporated into Him, it is reckoned as if it were ours, so that because of it we are accounted righteous.* And immediately he adds, that as *Jacob* being cloathed with the robes of his elder brother, obtained the blessing of his Father: so we must be clothed with the righteousnesse of Christ our elder brother, that God may bestow the blessing of justification upon us.

Et velut ille quondam *Iacob*, quum nativitate primogenitus non esset, sub habitu fratris occultatus, atque ejus veste indutus, quæ odorem optimum spirabat, seipsum insinuavit patri, ut sub alienâ personâ benedictionem primò genituræ acciperet: Ita & nos sub Christi primo geniti fratris nostri pretiosâ puritate delitescere, bono ejus odore fragrare, ejus perfectione vitia nostra sepeliri, & obtegi, atque ita nos piissimo patri ingerere, ut justitiæ benedictionem ab eodem assequamur necesse est. *Pigh. ibid.*

*Justificat ergo nos Deus pater bonitate suâ gratuitâ, quâ nos in Christo complectitur, dum eidem insertos innocentiâ & justitiâ Christi nos induit: quæ una ut vera, & perfecta est, quæ Dei sustinere conspectum potest, ita unam pro nobis sisti oportet tribunali Divini Judicii, &c. *Pigh. Ibid.*

* And againe, *God doth justifie us* (saith he) *of his free-goodnes, whereby he doth embrace us in Christ, whiles that he clothes us being ingraffed into him with Christs innocency and righteousnesse; which as it is alone true and perfect, able to indure the sight of God, so it alone must be presented for us at the tribunall of Gods Judgement.*

Quoniam dissimulare non possumus, hanc primam Doctrinæ Christianæ partem, obscuratam, quàm illustratam magis, à scholasticis, spinosis plerisque quæstionibus, & definitionibus, secundum quas nonnulli primam in omnibus authoritatem sibi arrogantes, & de omnibus facilè pronuntiantes, fortassis etiam nostram hanc damnarent sententiam, quâ propriam, & quæ ex suis operibus esset, coram Deo justitiam, derogamus omnibus Adæ filiis, & docuimus unâ Dei in Christo niti nos posse justitiâ, unâ illâ justos esse coram Deo, destitutos propriâ, nisi hoc ipsum astruxissemus aliquantò diligentiùs. *Pigh. Ibid.*

This, and much more to this purpose hath *Pighius*, and hee saith that hee could not dissemble that this prime part of Christian Doctrine was rather obscured, then illustrated by the Schoolemen, with thorny questions and definitions, and therefore he was the more diligent in the handling of this point, shewing that none of the sons of *Adam* can be justified before God by their own righteousnesse, and their own workes, but that all must rely onely on the righteousnesse of God in Christ, and that by it alone they being destitute of a righteousnesse of their owne, are righteous before God

God. *Pighius* is ſo plaine, and home in this point, that *Bellarmine* doth cenſure him as erroneous in it. And yet ſo powerfull and prevalent is truth, that it extorted even from *Bellarmine* himſelfe this confeſſion, *That becauſe of the uncertainty of a mans owne righteouſneſſe, and the danger of vaine glory it is moſt ſafe to repoſe all confidence only in Gods Mercy and Goodneſſe.* By his own confeſſion then it is moſt ſafe in matter of juſtification to renounce Workes, and to flie onely to Faith in the Lord Jeſus. The ancient Fathers alſo give teſtimony to this truth. *Hilarie* hath theſe very words, *Fides ſola juſtificat*, i. e. *Faith alone doth juſtifie.* † *Auſtine* in effect ſayes the ſame, when hee ſaith, *Our righteouſneſſe in this life is ſo great, that it conſiſts rather in forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, then in perfection of vertues.* And ſo when hee ſaith, *Woe even to the laudable life of men, if thou (O Lord) laying aſide mercy ſhall enter into the examination of it.* To this purpoſe alſo is that which hee ſaith upon thoſe words of *David, Enter not into judgement With thy ſervant O Lord, &c. How right ſoever* (ſaith hee) *I thinke my ſelfe, thou bringeſt forth a rule out of thy treaſure, and trieſt me by it, and I am found crooked.* Thus alſo * *Bernard, Lord* (ſaith he) *I will make mention of thy righteouſneſſe onely; for it alſo is mine, ſeeing that thou of God art made unto me righteouſneſſe. Muſt I feare leſt this one righteouſneſſe will not ſuffice us both? No, it is not a ſhort cloake, that cannot cover two.* And againe, *It is ſufficient for mee unto all righteouſneſſe, to have him onely propitious, againſt whom onely I have ſinned. Not to ſinne is Gods righteouſneſſe, mans righteouſneſſe is Gods indulgence.* Thus then in the point of juſtification wee have both Scriptures and Fathers: yea and divers Papiſts

Bell. de Iuſtif. l.2.c.1.

Propter incertitudinem propriæ juſtitiæ, & periculum inanis gloriæ tutiſſimum eſt fiduciam totam in ſolâ Dei miſericordiâ & benignitate reponere. *Bell. de Iuſtif. lib. 5. cap. 7.*

Hil. in Mat. can. 8.

†Tanta eſt juſtitia noſtra in hâc vitâ, ut potius remiſſione peccatorum conſtet, quàm perfectione virtutum. *Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 19. cap. 22.*

Væ etiam laudabili vitæ hominum, ſi remotâ miſericordiâ diſcutias eam. *Aug. Confeſſ. lib. 9 cap. 13.*

Quantumlibet rectus mihi videar, producis tu de theſauro tuo regulam, & coaptas me ad eam, & pravus invenior. *Aug. in Pſal. 142. (vel 143.) 2.*

*Domine memorabor juſtitiæ tuæ ſolius; ipſa enim eſt & mea. Nempe factus es mihi tu juſtitia à Deo. Numquid mihi verendum, ne non una ambobus ſufficiat? Non eſt pallium breve, quod non poſſit operire duos. *Bern. in Cant. Serm. 61.*

Sufficit mihi ad omnem juſtitiam ſolum habere propitium, cui ſoli peccavi. Non peccare Dei juſtitia eſt, hominis juſtitia, indulgentia Dei. *Ber. in Cant. Ser. 23.*

alſo

alſo concurring with us. As for the two places of Scripture alledged by the Marqueſſe; the former, *viz.* that 1 *Corin.* 13.2. ſpeaketh not of juſtifying Faith, but of a Faith of working miracles, as is cleare by the words themſelves being fully cited. which run thus, *Though I have all faith, ſo that I could remove mountaines, and have not charity, I am nothing.*

* Πίστιν νῦν ἃ τὴν τῶν πιστῶν τὴν κοινὴν καὶ καθολικὴν λέγει, ἀλλὰ τὸ χάρισμα τὸ τῆς πίστεως. εἴν γάρ τι χαρίσμαι &c. *Oecumen.* 1 *Cor.* 13.

* *Oecumenius* upon the place notes that by *Faith* there is not meant that Faith, which is common to all Believers, but a Faith peculiar to ſuch as had the gift of working miracles. And though † *Eſtius* (a learned Romaniſt) in his Commentary upon the place ſeeke to draw it another way, yet commenting upon 1 *Cor.* 12. 9. hee ſaith that the Greeke Expoſitors doe rightly underſtand it of that Faith, which is ſpoken of *Chap.*13. *If I have all Faith, &c.* that is, of the Faith of ſignes, and miracles, as they call it, which Faith (hee ſaith) is not properly a ſanctifying grace, but onely ſuch a grace as is given for the benefit of others.

† Rectè Græci eam intelligunt fidem, de quâ *cap.* 13. Si habuero omnem fidem, &c. Græci fidem ſignorum, & miraculorum appellant. Et hæc fides ſecundum ſe, tantùm eſt gratia gratis data, hoc eſt, ad aliorum utilitatem propriè conceſſa, &c. *Eſtius ad* 1 *Cor.* 12. 9.

The other place, *viz.* Jam. 2. 24. doth ſeeme to make againſt us, but indeed it doth not. For S. *James* ſaying that *a man is juſtified by Workes, and not by Faith onely,* meanes onely thus, as * *Cajetan* himſelfe doth expound it, that we are not juſtified by a barren Faith, but by a Faith, which is fruitfull in good Workes.

* Non fide ſterili, ſed fæcundâ operibus juſtificamur. *Cajetan: in Iac.* 2.

This appeares to be his meaning by his whole diſcourſe from *verſ.*14. to the end of the Chapter, wherein hee bends himſelfe againſt thoſe, who preſume of ſuch a faith as is without workes: and more ſpecially, it may appeare by the verſes immediately preceding, wherein hee ſaith, that *Abraham* was juſtified by workes, when hee offered up *Iſaac*; and that Faith wrought with his workes, and by workes was Faith made perfect: and the Scripture was fulfilled, which ſaith, *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteouſneſſe.* Now this clearly ſhewes that *Abraham* was juſtified by Faith, and not by workes, onely his workes did ſhew, that his Faith was a

true

true juſtifying Faith indeed, and not, as it is in many that pretend and profeſſe Faith, a vaine ſhew of Faith, and a meere ſhadow of it. For that, which S. *Iames* citeth, *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteouſneſſe*, was, as appeares by the ſtory in the booke of *Geneſis*, long before that *Abraham* offered up *Iſaac*; and by thoſe very words Saint *Paul* proveth, *Rom.*4. that wee are juſtified by Faith, and not by Workes. Therefore when S. *Iames* ſaith that by *Abrahams* offering up of *Iſaac* that Scripture was fulfilled, the meaning is, that thereby it did appeare that it was truly ſaid of *Abraham*, that hee believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteouſneſſe, his readineſſe in that worke to obey God, did demonſtrate that hee believed God indeed, and that his faith was of a right ſtampe. Thus alſo is it ſaid, that by workes faith was made perfect, *viz.* even as the Lord ſaid unto *Paul, My ſtrength is made perfect in weakeneſſe*, 2 Cor. 12. 9. that is, Gods ſtrength doth exerciſe it ſelfe, and ſhew how great it is, in mans weakneſſe. So *Abrahams* workes did ſhew how great his faith was; in this ſenſe his workes did make his faith perfect, not that they did adde any thing unto it, no more then mans weakneſſe doth adde unto Gods ſtrength.

This opinion of yours (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *S. Aug. de fide & oper. cap.* 14. *ſaith was an old hereſie, in the Apoſtles time: and in the Preface of his comment upon the* 32. Pſal. *he calles it the right way to hell, and damnation.* See *Orig. in* 5. *to the Rom. S. Hilar. chap.* 7. *in Mat. S. Ambr.* 4. *ad Heb.*

Anſw. * *Auſtine de fid. & oper. c.* 14. ſpeakes nothing againſt our Opinion, but ſomething for it. That which hee ſpeaketh by way of reproofe is againſt thoſe, who ſo thinke that Faith alone will ſuffice, as that they heede not to doe good workes, nor to order their life and converſation aright. But this is nothing to us, who are farre from holding ſuch a Faith as that ſufficient. But in the ſame place *Auſtine* hath this for our purpoſe, that when the Apoſtle ſaith that a Man is juſtified by Faith without the Workes of the Law, hee did not intend that the Workes

* Quarè jam illud videamus, quod excutiendum eſt à cordibus religioſis, ne malâ ſecuritate ſalutem ſuam perdant, ſi ad eam obtinendam ſufficere ſolam fidem putaverint, benè autem vivere, & bonis operibus viam Dei tenere neglexerint. *Aug. de fid. & oper. c.* 14.

Cum ergò dicit Apoſtolus, arbitrari ſe juſtificari hominem per fidem ſine operibus legis, non hoc agit, ut præceptâ & profeſsâ fide opera juſtitiæ contemnantur, ſed ut ſciat ſe quiſque per fidem poſſe juſtificari, etiamſi legis opera non præceſſerint. Sequuntur enim juſtificatum, non præcedunt juſtificandum. *Aug. Ibid.*

of Righteouſneſſe ſhould be contemned, but that every one ſhould know, that hee may be juſtified by faith, though the workes of the Law did not goe before. For (ſaith hee) *they follow a man being juſtified, they doe not goe before a man being to be juſtified.* If (as this Father affirmeth) a man muſt firſt be juſtified, before hee can doe good workes; then good workes are no cauſe of juſtification, but an effect of it. For the other place of *Auſtine*, which the Marqueſſe alledgeth, there is none ſuch, that I can finde, *viz.* no preface of his comment upon *Pſal.* 32. but in the comment it ſelfe I finde this, which makes for us. *Doeſt thou not heare the Apoſtle, The juſt ſhall live by Faith? Thy faith is thy righteouſneſſe.* What *Origen* ſaith on *Rom.* 5. having not his workes now at hand, I cannot tell; but I ſee what *Bellarmine* cites out of him on *Rom.* 4. and perhaps ſo it ſhould have been in the Marqueſſe his writing. However there is no doubt but *Bellarmine* would have made uſe of it, if there had been any thing more for his purpoſe on *Rom.* 5. Now on *Rom.* 4. *Origen* ſaith, that *whoſo believe Chriſt, but doe not put off the old man with his deeds, their faith cannot be imputed unto them for righteouſneſſe.* This wee doe eaſily aſſent unto, it being our profeſſed opinion (as hath beene ſhewed before by *Bellarmines* owne confeſſion) that though faith alone doe juſtifie, yet if it be ſuch a faith as is alone, and is not accompanied with good workes, it is not that faith, which doth juſtifie. As little is that of *Hilarie* againſt us, *The ſafety of the Nations is all in faith; and the life of all is in Gods Precepts.* That faith, which alone doth juſtifie, is not ſo alone, but that there is joyned with it a care and indeavour to obſerve all Gods Precepts. Of the ſame nature is that of † *Ambroſe* (if *Ambroſe* were the Author of

Non audiſti Apoſtolum, Juſtus ex fide vivet? Fides tua, juſtitia tua. *Aug. in Pſal.* 32.

Credentibus quidem Chriſto, nec tamen deponentibus veterem hominem cum actibus ſuis, fides reputari non poteſt ad juſtitiam. *Ori. in Rom.* 4. *citat. à Bell. de Iuſtif. lib.* 1. *cap.* 25.

Salus gentium omnis in fide eſt, & in præceptis Domini vita eſt univerſorum. *Hil. cap.* 7. *in Mat.*

†Sola fides non ſufficit, operari per dilectionẽ fidem neceſſarium eſt, & converſari dignè Deo. — Non ſufficit fides, ſed debet addi & vita condigna, & multum ſtudium debet adhiberi, ne fides ſit otioſa *Ambroſ in. Heb.* 4.

thoſe

thoſe commentaries) *Faith alone is not ſufficient; it is neceſſary that faith worke by love, and that men walke worthy of God. Faith is not ſufficient, but there muſt alſo be added a life anſwerable, and much care muſt be had, that faith be not idle.* All this wee hold, that faith muſt not be idle, but operative, and working through love; and ſuch is the nature of true juſtifying faith, as the Apoſtle teacheth, *Gal.*5.6. But all this is nothing againſt juſtification by faith alone without workes, *viz.* as concurring unto juſtification.

In the next place the Marqueſſe pleades for the merit of good workes; and that from *Mat.*6.27. (ſo it is printed, but it ſhould be *Mat.* 16. 27.) *Hee ſhall reward every man according to his workes.* And Mat.5.12. *Great is your reward in Heaven. Reward at the end* (ſaith he) *preſuppoſes merit in the worke: the diſtinction of* ſecun dum, *and* propter opera, *is too nice to make ſuch a diviſion in the Church.* Page 65.

Anſw. But that mens good workes doe not merit any reward at the hands of God, our Saviour hath ſufficiently ſhewed, ſaying, *When yee have done all things, that are commanded you, ſay, Wee are unprofitable ſervants, wee have done but what our duty was to do,* Luke 17.10. If (as † *Theophylact* notes upon the place) when wee have done all things that are commanded us, we muſt take heede of thinking highly of our ſelves: how much more ought wee to be farre from ſuch preſumption, when as wee are ſo farre from obeying all Gods Commandements! Beſides, if we doe any thing that is good, wee doe it not of our ſelves, by our own ſtrength, but it is God that doth inable us, and make us to doe it: and therefore properly wee cannot merit by it; for wee are beholding unto God, and not God beholding unto us for it. *I have laboured more abundantly then they all, yet not I, but the grace of God, that was with mee,* ſaith the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 15.10. Againe, the reward which the godly receive in Heaven, doth infinitly exceede their workes, and therefore cannot bee merited by them. The moſt that wee can doe, is to ſuffer for the Name of Chriſt; yet *the ſufferings of this preſent life are not worthy to*

† εἰ δὲ καὶ ὅταν πάσας τὰς ἐντολὰς ποιήσωμεν, οὐδὲ τότε ὀφείλομεν οἰεσθαί τι μέγα, τί γενόμεθα, ὅταν μηδὲ τὸ πολλοστὸν μέρος τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ θεοῦ καλοφθῶμεν ἢ ἐπαιρώμεθα; *Theophyl. ad Luc.* 17.10.

be compared with the glory that ſhall be revealed in us. Rom. 8. 18. Both theſe reaſons doth *Bernard* alledge againſt merits. *The merits of men* (ſaith hee) *are not ſuch, as that becauſe of them life eternall ſhould be due unto them of right, or that God ſhould doe them wrong if hee ſhould not give it. For to ſay nothing of this, that all merits are Gods gifts, and ſo man is rather indebted unto God for them, then God unto man; what are all merits unto ſo great glory?* Here *Bernard* uſeth indeed the word merits, but ſo as that hee plainely denieth the thing, which our adverſaries underſtand by it, and by a double argument confuteth their opinion. Both theſe arguments alſo to this purpoſe, before *Bernard* did *Fulgentius* uſe, who ſpeaking of eternall life, ſaith, *It is not unjuſtly called grace, becauſe not only God doth recompence his gifts with his gifts, but becauſe the grace of Gods retribution doth ſo abound, that it incomparably and ineffably exceedes all the merit of mans will and worke, though it be good, and ſuch as God hath given.* To this purpoſe hee cites *Rom.* 8. 18. and 2 *Cor.* 4. 17. And *Gregorius Magnus* not onely uſeth theſe ſame Arguments againſt the Merits of good workes, but alſo hath that very diſtinction of *ſecundum opera*, and *propter opera*, which the Marqueſſe ſo much diſdaineth. *If* (ſaith *Gregorie*) *the happine ſſe of the Saints be mercy, and be not acquired by Merits, where is that which is written, Thou will render to every one according to his workes? If it be rendered according to workes, how ſhall it be accounted mercy? But it is one thing to render according*

Neque enim talia ſunt hominum merita, ut propter ea vita æterna debeatur ex jure, aut Deus injuriam aliquam faceret, niſi eam donaret. Nam ut taceam quòd merita omnia ſunt dona Dei, & ita homo magis propter ipſa Deo debitor eſt, quam Deus homini; quid ſunt merita omnia ad tantam gloriam? *Bern. in Annunt. B. Mariæ Serm.* 1.

Gratia autem etiam ipſa (ſc. vita æterna) non injuſtè dicitur, quia non ſolum donis ſuis Deus dona ſua reddit, ſed quia tantum etiam ibi gratia Divinæ retributionis exuberat, ut incomparabiliter, atque ineffabiliter omne meritum quamvis bonæ, & ex Deo datæ humanæ voluntatis, atque operationis excedat. *Fulgent. ad Monim. lib.* 1.

Quòd ſi illa ſanctorum felicitas miſericordia eſt, & non meritis acquiritur, ubi erit quod ſcriptum eſt, Et tu reddes, unicuique ſecundum opera ſua?

Si ſecundum opera redditur, quomodo miſericordia æſtimabitur? Sed aliud eſt ſecundum opera reddere, & aliud propter ipſa opera reddere. In eo. n. quod ſecundum opera dicitur, ipſa operum qualitas intelligitur, ut cujus apparuerint bona opera, ejus ſit & retributio gloriosa. Illi namque, beatæ vitæ, in quâ cum Deo, & de Deo vivitur, nullus poteſt æquari labor, nulla opera comparari, præſertim cum Apoſtolus dicat, Non ſunt condignæ paſſiones hujus temporis ad futuram gloriam, quæ revelabitur in nobis. Quinquam & ex hoc quoque miſericordia jure poſſit nominari, quia propter illis operibus datur, quæ ſine præventu miſericordiæ Dei nemo aſſequitur. *Greg. in 7. pœnitent. Pſal. five in Pſ.* 143. 8.

to

to Workes, and another thing to render, becauſe of the Workes themſelves. In that there is a rendring according to workes, the quality of workes is conſidered, ſo as that Whoſe workes are found to be good, his reward alſo ſhall be glorious. For unto that bleſſed life, in which Wee live with God, and of God, no labour can be equall, no Workes comparable, eſpecially when as the Apoſtle ſaith, The ſufferings of this preſent time are not worthy of that glory, Which ſhall be revealed in us. Beſides alſo in this reſpect it may be juſtly called mercy, becauſe it is given for thoſe workes, Which none can attaine unto without the prevention of Gods mercy. Thus *Gregorie*, who above a thouſand yeeres agoe was Biſhop of *Rome*, both argues for us, and alſo by a diſtinction anſwers that which is objected againſt us, *viz.* that God doth render to all according to their workes. And for the word *reward*, which the Scripture often uſeth, it doth not preſuppoſe merit; for a reward may proceede from the bounty of the giver, not from the merit of the receiver. They that wrought but one houre in the Vineyard, though they received a penny, as much as they that laboured all the day, though (I ſay) they received this as the reward of their labour, yet did they not merit it by their labour. This very parable doth *Proſper* (or who ever was the Author of the Booke *de vocatione gentium*,) apply in this manner; *Without doubt* (ſaith hee) *they that were ſent into the Vineyard at the eleventh houre, and were made equall with thoſe that wrought the whole day, repreſent the condition of thoſe whom to commend the excellency of grace Gods goodneſſe doth reward in the end of the day, and in the concluſion of life, not paying the price of labour, but powring out the riches of his bounty upon them, Whom hee hath choſen without labour; that ſo they alſo, who have indured much labour, and yet have received no more then they that were laſt, may underſtand, that they have received the gift of grace, not the reward (viz.* the deſerved reward *) of their works.* Thus both Scriptures and Fathers are againſt the opinion of the Church of *Rome* as touching Merits. I will adde to what hath beene already alledged,

Sine dubio horâ undecimâ intromiſſi in vineam, & totius diei operariis exæquati, iſtorum præferunt ſortem, quos ad commendandam gratiæ excellentiam in defectu diei, & concluſione vitæ divina indulgentia muneratur, non labori pretium ſolvens, ſed divitias bonitatis ſuæ in eos, quos ſine laboribus elegit, effundens; ut etiam hi, qui in multo labore ſudarunt, nec ampliùs quàm noviſſimi, acceperunt, intelligant donum ſe gratiæ, non operum accepiſſe mercedem. *De vocat. gent. lib.* 1. 17.

ledged, that of * *Bernard, Thy merit is Gods mercy. I am not altogether without merit, so long as hee is not without mercy.* See what merit it is that hee builds upon, no merit of his own, but meerly Gods mercy. And this was it that *Nehemiah* did flie unto, even when hee recorded the good that hee had done, *Remember me O Lord* (said hee) *concerning this, and* (what? reward mee according to the greatneſſe of my merit? no, but) *ſpare mee according to the greatneſſe of thy mercy.* Neh. 13.22. * *Bernard* to this purpoſe againe, *It is enough unto merit, to know that merits are not ſufficient.* The Romiſh Doctrine of merits die not pleaſe *Ferus*, a late member of that Church, *If thou wouldeſt keepe* (ſaith hee) *the grace and favour of God, make no mention of thy Merits: for God will give all things out of mercy.*

* *Bellarmine* himſelfe, though hee diſputed eagerly for Merits, yet (it ſeemes) durſt not rely on them, confeſſing (as was ſhewed before) that *it is the ſafeſt courſe to put our whole truſt meerely in Gods Mercy.* But the Marqueſſe ſaith that the Fathers were of their opinion, citing *Ambr. de apol. David. cap. 6. Hieron. lib. 3. contra Pelag. Aug. de Spir. & lit. cap. ult.*

And firſt for *Ambroſe* in the place cited, it's true, hee ſpeakes merits; but here wee muſt remember what one of their owne writers doth tell us, namely † *Eſtius*, that the ancient Divines did often uſe the word *Merit* very largely, and not properly. And thus did *Ambroſe* uſe the word, ſaying, *Habet quis bona Merita, one hath good Merits*, that is, good workes, which hee calles Merits, becauſe they doe impetrate or obtaine a reward, though not properly merit it, the ancients (as *Eſtius* obſerves) uſing merit for impetration. But that *Ambroſe* there did not make good workes to be truly and pro-

* Meritum proinde meum miſeratio Domini. Non planè ſum meriti inops, quamdiu miſerationum ille non fuerit. *Bern. in Cant. Serm. 61.*

* Sufficit ad meritum ſcire quòd non ſufficiant merita. *Bern. in Cant. Serm. 68.*

Si Dei gratiam & favorem conſervare cupis, nullam tuorum meritorum fac mentionem: ex miſericordiâ enim cuncta donare vult. *Ferus in Mat. 20. 1.*

* *Bellarmine* alſo ſaith that *Bernard*, prudenter non confidebat in meritis ſuis, ſed in ſolâ miſericordiâ Domini, *did wiſely not truſt in his merits, but onely in Gods mercy.* Bell. de Juſtif. lib. 5. cap. 6.

† Quamvis ipſa juſtitia, & peccatorum remiſſio non poſſint propriè merces vocari reſpectu fidei, pœnitentiæ, &c. attamen veteres theologi meriti nomen memoratis operibus reſpectu juſtificationis, ac peccatorum remiſſionis paſſim aſcribunt, extenſo vid. meriti nomen ad illud quod recentiores congruum vocant, id eſt, ad impetrationem *Eſtius ad Heb. 11. 6.*

properly meritorious, appeares by the words immediately following, *habet & vitia, atque peccata*; *hee hath alſo vices and ſins.* Now ſurely thoſe good workes, which have vices and ſinnes mixed with them, cannot be properly meritorious: in that caſe there is great need to crave mercy, but no cauſe to plead merit. For *Hierome.lib.3.contra Pelag.* I finde nothing at all that doth ſo much as ſeeme to aſſert merits, except perhaps thoſe words, *here (in this life) is labour, and ſtriving; there (in the life to come) is the reward of labour, and vertue.* But reward doth not alwayes preſuppoſe merit, as I have ſhewed before. Mercy, I am ſure, and merit are inconſiſtent, and * *Hierome* in that very Book, which the Marqueſſe citeth, plainly teſtifieth that there is no man, whoſe workes are ſo good, and his obedience ſo perfect, but that ſtill hee hath need of Gods mercy. And hee taxeth his adverſarie (*Pelagius* I thinke) as proud and Phariſaicall for ſaying, that he doth worthily lift up his hands to God, and doth pray with a good conſcience, who can ſay, *Thou, O Lord, knoweſt, how holy, how innocent, how pure from all fraud, injury and rapine the hands are, that I ſpread forth unto thee; how juſt, immaculate, and free from all lying the lips are, with which I powre forth prayers unto thee, that thou mayeſt have mercy on mee.* Hee tells him that *David* ſung another Song, ſaying, *My wounds ſtinke and are corrupt becauſe of my fooliſhneſſe*, Pſal. 38. 5. *Enter not into judgement with thy ſervant, for in thy ſight ſhall no man living be juſtified.* Pſal. 143. 2.

Ut hìc labor ſit, atque contentio, ibi laboris virtutiſque præmium. *Hieron. contra Pelag.lib.3. cap 5.*

*Quia homines poſſibilia non faciunt, idcircò omins mundus ſubditus eſt Deo, & indiget miſericordiâ ejus. Aut certè ſi oſtendere poteris, qui univerſi compleverit, tunc poteris demonſtrare eſſe hominem, qui non indiget miſericordiâ Dei. *Hieron. Ibid. cap.* 1.

Ille, inquis, meritò ad Deum extollit manus, ille preces bonâ conſcientiâ fundit, qui poteſt dicere, Tu enim noſti, Domine, quàm ſanctæ, quàm innocentes, quàm puræ ſint ab omni fraude, & injuriâ, & rapinâ, quas ad te expando, manus; quàm juſta, quàm immaculata labia, & ab omni mendacio libera, quibus tibi, ut mihi miſerearis, preces fundo. Chriſtiani eſt hæc, an Phariſæi ſuperbientis oratio? *Hieron. ibid. cap. 5. David* loquitur, *&c. Ibid.*

And that *Eſay* lamented ſaying, *Woe is mee, for I am undone; becauſe I am a man of uncleane lips, &c.* Iſai. 6. 5. * And hee askes

Eſaias plangit. &c. Ibid.

* Et poſt tantũ tumorem, orantiſque jactantiam, & confidentiam ſanctitatis, quaſi ſtultus ſtultis perſuadere conaris, ut in extremo dicas, quibus tibi, ut mihi miſerearis, preces fundo. Si ſanctus es, ſi innocens, ſi ab omni ſorde purgatus, ſi nec ſermone, nec opere peccaſti, diſcente Iacobo, Qui in verbo non peccat, iſte perfectus eſt vir; & nemo poteſt refrænare linguam ſuam; quomodo miſericordiam deprecaris, *&c. Ibid.*

him,

him, how after all this ſwelling and boaſting of himſelfe, after all this confidence of his holineſſe, hee could pretend to deſire Gods mercy? For if hee were ſo holy, and innocent, ſo pure and perfect, then he had no neede to pray in that manner, *viz.* that God ſhould have mercy on him. This and more to this purpoſe hath *Hierome* in the place alledged, but whether this be for Merits, or againſt them, is eaſie to judge.

Neither hath * *Auſtine* in the place, which the Marqueſſe citeth, any thing (that I can ſee) to prove good workes meritorious, but ſomething to prove the contrary. For having cited many places of Scripture, which ſhew that none is ſo righteous as to be without ſinne, hee ſaith, *Hence it followeth, that it is neceſſary for every one to forgive, that hee may bee forgiven: and if hee have any righteouſneſſe, not to preſume that he hath it of his own, but to aſcribe it to Gods grace; and ſtill to hunger and thirſt for righteouſneſs from God, who doth ſo work in his Saints, whiles they are in this life, as that hee hath ſtill ſomething to adde to them that aske, and to pardon them that confeſſe. For that none living in this mortall body can be found ſo holy, but that ſtill hee hath neede of pardon.* And elſewhere he ſaith, *God doth crowne his own gifts, not thy merits.*

Page 66. The Marqueſſe goes on, ſaying, *We hold that Faith once had may be loſt, if wee have not care to preſerve it, you ſay it cannot, we have Scripture for it,* viz. Luke 8. 13. *They on the Rock are they, which when they heare, receive the Word with joy, which for a while believe, and in time of temptation fall away.* So 1 Tim. 1. 18, 19. *which ſome having put away have made ſhipwracke of their Faith.*

Anſw. We doe not hold that Faith cannot be loſt, though a man have no care to preſerve it; but that God will worke ſuch a care in thoſe, in whom hee hath wrought true juſtifying Faith, that they ſhall never loſe it. *I will put my feare* (ſaith hee) *in their*

*Conſequens eſſe video, ut omni homini ſit neceſſarium dare, ut detur illi, dimittere, ut dimittatur illi; & ſi quid habet juſtitiæ, non de ſuo ſibi eſſe præſumere, ſed de gratiâ juſtificantis Dei; & adhuc tamen ab illo eſurire & ſitire juſtitiam, qui eſt panis vus, & apud quem fons vitæ, qui ſic operatur juſtificationem in ſanctis ſuis, in hujus vitæ tentatione laborantibus, ut tamen ſit, & quod petentibus largiter adjiciat, & quod confitentibus clementer ignoſcat. Sed inveniant iſti, ſi poſſunt, aliquem ſub onere corruptionis hujus viventem, cui jam non habeat Deus quod ignoſcat. *Aug. de Spir. & lit. cap. ult.*

Dona ſua coronat Deus, non merita tua. *Aug. de grat. & lib. arb. c. 6.*

their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from me. Jer.32.40. Chriſt prayed for *Peter*, that his faith might not faile, *Luke* 22.32. And ſo he prayed both for him and others, even for all that belong unto him. *I pray for them* (ſaith he) *I pray not for the World, but for them, which thou haſt given me: for they are thine.* Joh.17.9. And *verſ.*11. *Holy Father, keepe through thine own name, thoſe whom thou haſt given mee.* So the Apoſtle telleth us, that *whom God did predeſtinate, them hee alſo called* (viz. *according to his purpoſe*, verſ.28.) *and whom hee called, them hee alſo juſtified; and whom hee juſtified, them hee alſo glorified.* Rom.8.30. This clearly ſhewes, that all that are once juſtified, ſhall certainly be glorified, and conſequently that juſtifying faith once had cannot be quite loſt. Againe, They that truly believe, are the ſons of God. *Gal.*3. 26. Now *the ſervant abideth not in the houſe for ever: but the ſon abideth ever.* Joh.8.35. Therefore true Faith cannot be loſt; the children of God cannot fall away. And to this doe the Fathers accord. *Cyprian* is much to this purpoſe; *The ſtrength of ſuch as are truly faithfull, doth remaine unmoveable, and the integrity of thoſe that feare God, and love him with the whole heart, doth continue ſtable and ſtrong.* And again, *The Lord, Who is the protectour and defender of his people, doth not ſuffer Wheat to be taken away out of his floore: onely chaffe can be ſeparated from the Church.*

Manet verè fidelium robur immobile; & apud timentes ac diligentes toto corde Deum ſtabilis, & fortis perſeverat integritas. *Cypr. Epiſt.* 52.

Non patitur Dominus populi ſui protector & tutor, triticum de aréâ ſuâ diripi, ſed ſolæ poſſunt paleæ de eccleſiâ ſeparari. *Cypr. Epiſt.*69.

And againe, *Let none thinke that the good can depart out of the Church. The Winde doth not carry away the Wheat; neither doth the ſtorme overthrow the Tree, that hath taken ſolid roote. The empty chaffe is toſſed with the tempeſt: the weake Trees are throwne down With the whirlewinde. This the Apoſtle* John *doth curſe, and ſmite, ſaying, They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued With us: but they went out, that they might be made manifeſt, that they were not all of us,* 1 Joh. 2. 19. And to adde one teſtimony of his more, *Peter* (ſaith hee) *ſpeaking for all, and anſwering in the name of the Church,*

Nemo exiſtimet bonos de eccleſia poſſe diſcedere. Triticum non rapit ventus; nec arborem ſolidâ radice fundatam procella ſubvertit. Inanes paleæ tempeſtate jactantur; invalidæ arbores turbinis incurſione evertuntur. Hoc execratur & percurit Joannes Apoſtolus dicens, Ex nobis exierunt, &c. *Cypr. de unit. Eccleſ.*

ſaith,

Petrum cum pro omnibus loquens, & Ecclesiæ voce respondens, ait, Domine, ad quem ibimus? verba vitæ, &c. significans scil. qui à Christo recesserint, culpâ suâ perire: Ecclesiam tamen, quæ in Christum credit, & quæ semel id, quod cognoverit, teneat, nunquam omninò ab eo discedere: & eos esse Ecclesiam, qui in domo Dei permanent, plantationem verò à Deo Patre non esse, quos videmus non frumenti stabilitate solidari, sed tanquam paleas dissipandas inimici spiritu ventilari. De quibus ait Joannes in Epistolâ, Ex nobis exierunt, &c. *Cypr. Epist.* 55.

* Non ait quòd exeundo alieni facti sunt, sed quòd alieni erant, propter hoc eos exiisse declaravit. *Aug de baptis. contra Donatist. lib. 3. cap.* 19.

Eo ipso quòd discedis, & volas, paleam te esse indicas: qui triticum sunt, ferunt triturам. *Aug. in Ps.* 140.

Tunc verè sunt quod appellantur, si manserint in eo, propter quod sic appellantur. *Aug.*

Non est revera Domini corpus, quod cum illo non erit in æternum. *Aug. de doctr. Christ. lib. 3. cap.* 32.

* Neque fideles, quos hæreses potuerint demutare.——Nemo Christianus, nisi qui ad finem usque perseveraverit. Tu ut homo extrinsecus unumquenque nostri; putas quod vides; vides autem quousque oculos habes. Sed oculi Domini alti. Homo in faciem, Deus in præcordia contemplatur. Et ideò cognoscit Dominus

saith, Lord to whom shall we goe? Thou hast the words of eternall life, (Joh. 6. 68.) *signifying that they who depart from Christ, perish through their own fault: but that the Church, which believeth in Christ, and once holdeth that, which it hath knowne, doth never altogether depart from him; and that they are the Church, Who doe abide in the house of God: but that they are not the planting of God the Father, Whom wee see not to be strengthened With the stability of wheat, but to be blowne away with the breath of the enemy like chaffe, that is to be dissipated. Of whom* John *saith They went out from us, but they were not of us, &c.* * *Austine* also citing those words of S. *John*, saith, *Hee doth not say, that by going out they were made Aliens, but that therefore they went out because they were Aliens.* Againe, *In that* (saith he) *thou departest, and flyest away, thou shewest thy selfe to be chaffe: they that are Wheate, endure threshing.* And upon those words of our Saviour, *If yee continue in my Word, then you are my Disciples indeed*; Joh. 8. 31. hee saith thus, *Then they are indeed that Which they are called, if they continue in that, for Which they are so called.*

So againe, *That is not indeed the Body of Christ* (saith hee) *which shall not be With him for ever.*

So * *Tertullian* saith that such as fall away were never true Believers, and true Christians. Hee saith, man sees the outside of every one, and thinkes what hee sees; but God sees into the heart, and therefore knowes who are his; and roots out every Plant, that hee hath not planted. And *let the chaffe of light faith* (saith hee) *flie away*

as

as much as it will with every blaſt of temptations, by ſo much will the heape of Corne be the more cleane to be laid up in the Lords Garners. Did not ſome of Chriſts Diſciples, being offended, turne away? yet the reſt would not therefore leave him: but they that knew him to be the Word of life, and ſent of God, did continue with him to the end.——It is a leſſe matter, if ſome did forſake his Apoſtle, as Phygellus, *and* Hermogenes, *and* Philetus, *and* Hymenæus. Then hee cites that of S. *John, They went out from us, but they were not of us, &c.*

qui ſunt ejus: & plantam, quam non plantavit Pater eradicat.——Avolent quantum volent paleæ levis fidei quocunque afflatu tentationum, eo purior maſſa frumenti in horrea Domini reponetur. Nonne ab ipſo Domino quidam diſcentium ſcandalizati diverterunt? Nec tamen propterea cæteri quoque diſcedendum à veſtigiis ejus putaverunt: ſed qui ſcierunt illum vitæ eſſe verbum, & à Deo veniſſe, perſeveraverunt in comitatu ejus uſque ad finem.——Minus eſt ſi Apoſtolum ejus aliqui, *Phygellus*, & *Hermogenes*, & *Philetus*, & *Hymenæus* reliquer unt. ——Ex nobis, inquit, prodierunt, ſed non fuerunt ex nobis, &c. *Tertull. de Præſcript. cap.* 3.

Thus alſo * *Gregory* ſpeaking of the holy Ghoſt ſaith, that *in reſpect of ſome vertues he alwayes abides in the hearts of the Saints, but in reſpect of ſome hee comes ſo as to goe away, and goes away ſo as to come againe. For in reſpect of Faith, Hope and Charity, and other good things, without which there is no comming to Heaven, as Humility, Chaſtity, Juſtice and Mercy, in reſpect of theſe hee never forſaketh the hearts of the upright. But in reſpect of Prophecy, Eloquence, and working of miracles ſometimes hee is with the Elect, ſometimes hee withdrawes himſelfe from them.* This teſtimony of *Gregory* is alſo cited by *Gratian*, who from thence, and other teſtimonies of the Fathers inferrs thus much, that *Charity once had* (and it is as true of Faith; for Charity cannot be without it, but doth proceede from it, 1 *Tim.* 1.5.) *cannot be loſt.* Thus wee have not onely the Scriptures, and Fathers, but alſo the Canon-law it ſelfe for us. Thoſe places, which the Marqueſſe alledgeth to prove that faith may be loſt, doe not ſpeake of juſtifying Faith, whereby one is ingraffed into Chriſt, and made a member of his Body, but either

* In ſanctorum quippe cordibus juxta quaſdam virtutes ſemper permanet, juxta quaſdam verò receſſurus venit, & venturus recedit. In fide etenim, ſpe, atque charitate, & in bonis aliis, ſine quibus ad cæleſtem patriam non poteſt veniri, ſicut eſt humilitas, caſtitas, juſtitia atque miſericordia, perfectorum corda non deſerit. In prophetiæ verò virtute, doctrinæ facundiâ, miraculorum exhibitione, electis ſuis aliquando adeſt, aliquando ſe ſubtrahit. *Greg. hom.* 5 *in Ezech.*

Ex præmiſſis itaque apparet quòd Charitas ſemel habita ulteriùs non amittitur. *Grat. de pœnit. diſt.* 2.

of an outward profeſſion of the Faith, that is, of the Doctrine of Faith, as that 1 *Tim.*1.19. where the Apoſtle bids *Timothy hold faith* (*i.e.* the Doctrine of Faith) *and a good conſcience*; and addes that ſome having put away a good conſcience, *concerning Faith did make ſhipwrack*. that is, did forſake the Doctrine of Faith, and fall into Hereſie. Such were *Hymenæus* and *Alexander*, whom hee mentioneth *verſ.* 20. and ſaith that he delivered them unto Satan, *that they might learne not to blaſpheme*. And that which hee there calleth *Faith*, hee calleth *Truth*, 2 *Tim.*2. 18. where ſpeaking of *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, hee ſaith, *Who concerning the truth have erred, ſaying, that the Reſurrection is paſt already*. He addes that hereby they did *overthrow the Faith of ſome*, that is, they did draw them from the Faith, making them to embrace Hereſie. But that theſe ſeducers or ſeduced ones, were ever ſuch believers, as that they were indued with juſtifying Faith, the Apoſtle doth not ſay, neither can it be proved; *Tertullian* was of another minde, as appeares by his words before cited. Yea, ſo was S. *John*, whoſe words to this purpoſe both *Tertullian* and other Fathers (as I have ſhewed) have made uſe of, when hee ſaith, ſpeaking of ſuch as thoſe, *They went out from us, but they were not of us, &c.* 1 Joh.2.19. Or they ſpeak of an Hiſtoricall Faith, whereby one doth aſſent unto the truth of the Goſpell, and is ſomewhat affected with it, but it doth not take roote in the heart, as it is ſaid *Mat.*13.21. *yet hath hee not roote in himſelfe*: and therefore this is not ſuch a Faith, as wee ſpeake of, when wee ſay, that Faith cannot be loſt, *viz.* a Faith, whereby Chriſt is received, and doth dwell in the heart. *Joh.*1. 12. *Epheſ.*3.17. For all that Faith, which is ſpoken of *Luke* 8. 13. a man is but chaffe ſtill, and not true wheat whatſoever hee ſeeme either to himſelfe or others. They compared to the thorny ground, who *for a while believe*, are diſtinguiſhed from ſuch as have *a good and honeſt heart*, Luke 8.13,15. Therefore thoſe temporary believers are no ſound and ſincere Believers: *their heart is not right with God, and therefore they are not ſtedfaſt in his Covenant*. Pſal.78.37.

The Marqueſſe addes, *This is frequently affirmed by the Fathers*, viz. that Faith may be loſt; but hee cites onely *Auſtine de grat. & lib. arb. de corrept. & grat. & ad articulos*. Now I have produced

duced many teſtimonies of *Auſtine* to the contrary, as alſo of diverſe other Fathers, who ſpeake very home to our purpoſe. As for theſe places of *Auſtine* alledged againſt us, the two firſt are juſtly to be waved. For onely the bookes are cited, but no Chapters, whereas in the one booke there are 24. and 16. in the other. For the third place, it's true that *Auſtine* doth oftentimes in anſwer to the Articles impoſed upon him, deny that Gods predeſtination is the cauſe of mans non-perſeverance, as ſome did charge him to hold; why any fall away hee, ſhewes the cauſe to be in themſelves, not in God; *that it is not from Gods worke, but from their owne will: that they are not thruſt, that they may fall; nor caſt out, that they may depart.* But that true juſtifying Faith once had may be loſt, hee ſayes not any thing that way, but much againſt it in other places, as before is ſhewed.

Quòd ſi per generalitatem vocationis, & per abundantiam bonitatis Dei, etiam non perſeveraturi perſeveraturis admixti ſunt, hi cum à pietate deficiunt, non ex Dei opere, ſed ex ſuâ voluntate deficiunt, nec impelluntur ut cadant, nec ejiciuntur ut deſerant. *Aug. ad art. 16. Similiter etiam ad alios articulos.*

In the next place, *Wee hold* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *that God did never inevitably damne any man before hee was borne, or as you ſay from all eternity. You ſay hee did: wee have Scripture for what wee ſay,* Wiſd. 1. 13. *God made not death, neither hath he pleaſure in the deſtruction of the living.* 1 Tim. 2. 3, 4. *God our Saviour, who will have all men to be ſaved,* 2 Pet. 3. 9. *The Lord is not willing that any ſhould die, but that all ſhould come to repentance. And if you will not believe when hee ſaith ſo, believe him when hee ſweares it, As I live, ſaith the Lord, I doe not delight in the death of a ſinner.* Page 66.

Anſ. I doe not know any Proteſtant, who ſaith that God did damne any man before hee was borne, or from all eternity. For how ſhould that be? damning being taken (as uſually it is) for inflicting eternall puniſhment. For how can a man before hee hath any being, have eternall puniſhment inflicted upon him? yet * *Bernard* ſpeaketh of his being *damnatus antequam natus*, damned before hee was borne. I ſuppoſe hee meant that before he came out of the wombe hee was in the

Secundum exteriorem hominem de parentibus illis venio, qui me antè fecerunt damnatum, quàm natum. *Bern. meditat. cap. 2.*

eſtate of damnation by reaſon of the guilt of *Adams* ſinne imputed to him, and the corruption of nature inherent in him. How ever this is certaine, that (as * *Bernard* alſo ſaith) predeſtination is before all times, even from all eternity.

* Prædeſtinatio non duo ab exortu Eccleſiæ ſed ne à mundi principio quidem principium habuit, non denique à tempore illo, vel illo; ante tempora eſt. *Ber. in Cant. ſer. 78.*

Bell. de grat. & lib. arbit. lib. 2. cap. 16.

And *Bellarmine* obſerves, that though the uſe of the Schooles hath ſo prevailed, that they onely are ſaid to be predeſtinate; who are elected unto glory, and ſo in the Scriptures predeſtination is not uſed but in that ſenſe, yet *Auſtine* doth call reprobation predeſtination to deſtruction. Neither is there any queſtion betwixt us, and them of the Church of Rome, but that reprobation as well as election is from all eternity. And therefore as wee doe not ſay any more then they, that God doth damne any man from eternity; ſo they as well as wee doe ſay, that God doth reprobate many from eternity, even as many as hee doth not elect; now the elect are but few in compariſon, as our Saviour tells us, ſaying, *Many are called, but few are choſen. Mat.* 22. 14. But ſome may, and indeed doe ſay, *Gods reprobation is not the cauſe of any mans damnation, but mans own ſinne is the proper cauſe both of reprobation and damnation.* But though this be aſſerted by ſome of our adverſaries, yet others of that party will not approve of it. For *Reprobation* (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *doth comprehend two acts.* &c. *For firſt God hath not a will of ſaving them* (viz. the Reprobate) *And then he hath a will of damning them. And in reſpect of the former act there is no cauſe* (*of Reprobation*) *on mans part.* Therefore mans ſinne in *Bellarmines* judgementi is not the cauſe of Reprobation in reſpect of that act. Now if God have not a will to ſave a man, it is not poſſible that hee ſhould be ſaved: and if hee bee not ſaved, hee muſt bee being * damned. And therefore from that act of Gods Reprobation, which *Bellarmine* confeſſeth to have no cauſe on mans part, there inevitable followes mans damnation, though damnation be neither inflicted on man, nor intended to be inflicted on

So ſay the Tranſlators of the old Teſtament at Doway after Exodus in, The continuance of the Church.

Dicimus deinde Reprobationem duos actus comprehendere, &c. Primum enim non habet Deus voluntatem illos ſalvandi. Deinde habet voluntatem eos damnandi: & quidem quod attinet ad priorem actum, nulla datur ejus cauſa ex parte hominum, &c. *Bell. de grat. & lib arb. lib. 2. cap. 16.*

* *Viz.* if ever he have any being.

on him but for ſinne. Yet *Bellarmine* in that which hee ſaith, is not ſo accurate as hee might be; For *non habere voluntatem ſalvandi*, not to have a will to ſave a man, or not to will a mans ſalvation, is properly no act, but rather a negation of an act, and therefore indeed *Bellarmine* calles it *actum negativum* a negative act; but that (as I ſaid) is indeed no act at all, but a meere negation of it. And therefore *Alvarez* maketh the firſt act of Reprobation to be a poſitive act, whereby Gods Will is not to admit ſome unto life eternall. It's one thing not to have a will to ſave; and another thing to have a will not to ſave; the former is meerly negative, but the latter is poſitive. And hee proves that Reprobation doth include a poſitive act, becauſe the meere negative of not ordaining unto life eternall is even in reſpect of men and angells that onely may be, but never ſhall be. Thoſe God doth not will to ſave, and to glorifie, yet properly they are not the objects of Gods Reprobation.

Bellar. Ibid.

Reprobatio Dei æterna includit actum poſitivum, quo voluit quoſdam non admittere ad vitam æternam —Deus non verè non reprobavit homines vel angelos poſſibiles, qui nunquam erunt; & tamen circa illos ſe habuit negativè, non ordinando eos ad vitam æternam. Ergo Reprobatio includit actum poſitivum. *Alvar. de Auxil. lib. 11. diſput. 109. num. 5.*

The ſame * *Alvarez* ſaith that this poſitive act of Reprobation, whereby Gods Will and Pleaſure from eternity was, not to admit ſome into his Kingdome, was not conditionall, but abſolute, and in order of nature before the fore-knowledge of the ill uſe of free-will. And this hee proves from hence, that the Apoſtle *Rom. 9.* having inferred from what hee had ſaid of Predeſtination and Reprobation, *Therefore hee hath mercy on*

* Actus poſitivus, quo Deus ab æterno voluit non admittere quoſdam in ſuum regnum, non fuit conditionatus, ſed abſolutus, antecedens in ſigno rationis præſcientiam mali uſus liberi arbitrii, &c. ——— Probatur concluſio; nam Apoſtolus ad Rom. 9. poſtquam intulit ex his, quæ dixerat in eodem cap. de prædeſtinatione & Reprobatione, Ergo cujus vult miſeretur, & quem vult indurat; ſtatim proponit eorum querimoniam, quibus dura videtur Prædeſtinatio, & Reprobatio, antecedens præſcientiam meritorum, & ait, Quid adhuc queritur? voluntati enim ejus quis reſiſtit? Et huic objectioni occurit ſubdens, O homo tu quis es, &c. Annon habet poteſtatem figulus, &c. Hæc autem reſponſio & objurgatio non haberet locum, ſi Deus antecedenter ad præſcientiam mali uſus liberi arbitrii neminem reprobaſſet abſolutâ & efficaci voluntate. Poſſet enim facilè reſpondere Apoſt. quod ex bono, vel malo uſu liberi arbitrii creati, præcognito à Deo tanquam ex conditione ſine quâ non, dependet quòd providentia ſupernaturalis Dei circa unum habeat formaliter rationem Reprobationis, & non circa alium. *Alvar. diſput. 109. num. 6.*

whom

whom hee will have mercy, and whom hee will, hee hardeneth, presently brings in the complaint of thoſe, who thinke it hard, that God ſhould predeſtinate, and reprobate without having reſpect to merits, *Why then doth hee yet complaine? for who hath reſiſted his Will?* And hee anſwers, *O man who art thou that repliest againſt God? Shall the thing formed ſay to him that formed it, Why haſt thou made mee thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the ſame lumpe to make one veſſell unto honour, and another unto diſhonour?* Now this anſwer and reproofe (ſaith hee) ſhould have no place, if God did not before the foreknowledge of the ill uſe of Free-will reprobate ſome by an abſolute and efficacious will. For the Apoſtle might eaſily anſwer, that it depends upon the good or ill uſe of mans free-will, which God did fore-know, that ſome are reprobated, and not others. And hee cites * *Auſtine* ſaying, *Many are not ſaved, not becauſe they will not, but becauſe God will not, which moſt clearly appeares in young infants.*

This ſame Author alſo againe layes down this concluſion, † *Reprobation whereby God determines, not to give eternall life to ſome, and to ſuffer them to ſinne, is not conditionall, but abſolute; neither doth it preſuppoſe in God the fore-knowledge, or fore-ſight of the ill deſerts of the Reprobate, or of his perſeverance in ſinne unto the end of his life.*

* And againe, *Neither actuall ſinne, nor originall, nor both together, fore-ſeene of God, were the meritorious cauſe, or motive of any ones Reprobation, in reſpect of all the effects of it.*

† And hee takes *Aquinas* to be reſolute in this point, and hee cites him, ſaying, *As predeſtination doth include a will to conferre grace, and glory, ſo Reprobation doth include a will to ſuffer one to fall into ſinne, and to inflict the puniſhment of damnation for ſinne.*

* Multi ſalvi non fiunt, non quia ipſi nolunt, ſed quia Deus non vult; quod abſque ullâ caligine monſtratur in parvulis. *Aug. Epiſt.* 107. *citat. ab Alvar Ibid.*

† Reprobatio, quâ Deus ſtatuit non dare aliquibus vitam æternam, & permittere peccatũ eorum, non eſt conditionata, ſed abſoluta, nec præſupponit in Deo præſcientiam, vel prævitionem demeritorum ipſius reprobi, aut perſeverantiæ in peccato uſque ad ultimum vitæ *Alvar. diſp.* 110. *num.* 8.

* Neque peccatum actuale, neque originale, neque utrumque ſimul prævitum à Deo, fuit de facto cauſa meritoria, vel motiva Reprobationis alicujus, quantum ad omnes illus effectus. *Alv. ib. n.* 11.

† Exiſtimo S. Thomam reſolutoriè eandem docuiſſe ſententiam; etenim *art.* 3. *citat. in corp. ait,* Sicut prædeſtinatio includit voluntatem conferendi gratiam & gloriam; ita Reprobatio includit voluntatem permittendi aliquem cadere in culpam, & ferendi damnationis pœnam pro culpâ. *Alvar. Ibid.*

Hence

Hence *Alvarez* inferres, that according to *Aquinas* the permiſſion of the firſt ſinne for which a Reprobate is damned, is the effect of Reprobation. And hee addes that of this permiſſion there is no cauſe in the Reprobate. Becauſe before the permiſſion of the firſt ſinne, and before the firſt ſinne, there is no other ſinne; for if there were, then it were not ſimply the firſt ſinne; or man ſhould commit ſome other ſinne before, which God did not permit, whereas no ſinne can be committed but by Gods permiſſion. He cites alſo *Aquinas* againe ſpeaking thus, *why God doth chuſe ſome to glory, and reprobate others, there is no reaſon but onely Gods Will.* And having cited that of the Apoſtle *Rom. 9. The children being not yet borne, neither having done any good, or evill, that the purpoſe of God according to election might ſtand, not of Workes, but of him that calleth, it was ſaid unto her, The elder ſhould ſerve the younger, As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but* Eſau *have I hated*; having cited this (I ſay) hee addes that the Apoſtle here (both *Auſtine* and *Aquinas* avouching as much) plainly ſignifies, *that in the abſolute Election and Reprobation of Men, God did not looke at Mens merits, or demerits, but of his own pleaſure did chuſe, and predeſtinate one to glory, and not predeſtinate another, but by an abſolute Will did determine to ſuffer him to ſinne, and to be hardened, or to perſevere in ſinne to the end of his life, and to inflict eternall puniſhment upon him for ſin.*

Ergo ſecundum S. *Thomam* permiſſio primi peccati, propter quod reprobus damnatur, eſt effectus Reprobationis: ſed illius permiſſionis nulla datur cauſa ex parte reprobi: nam ante permiſſionem primi peccati, & ante primum peccatum non datur aliud peccatum præcedens: aliàs illud non eſſet ſimpliciter primum, vel in homine præcederet aliud peccatum commiſſum, Deo non permittente, &c. *Alvar. Ibib.*

Quare hos eligat ad gloriam, & illos reprobet, non habet rationem niſi divinam voluntatem. *Aquin. apud Alvar. Ibid.*

In quo teſtimonio, ut diſp. 37. num. 9. ex doctrinâ S. *Auguſtini*, & S. *Thomæ* oſtendimus, aperte ſignificatur in electione abſolutâ, & reprobatione hominum Deum non reſpexiſſe ad merita, vel demerita prævisa, ſed pro ſuo beneplacito iſtum elegiſſe, & prædeſtinaſſe ad gloriam, illum non prædeſtinaſſe, ſed voluntate abſolutâ ſtatuiſſe permittere peccatum illius, & obdurationem, ſive perſeverantiam in eodem peccato uſque ad ultimum vitæ, & pœnam æternam infligere propter idem peccatum. &c. *Ibid. num.* 12.

Hee brings in alſo *Auſtine* confuting thoſe, who ſay, that *Eſau* and *Jacob* being not yet borne, God did therefore hate the one, and love the other, becauſe hee did foreſee the workes that they would doe. *Who* (ſaid *Auſtine*) *can but wonder, that the*

Ideo, inquiunt, nondum natorum alium oderat, alium diligebat, quia eorum futura opera previdebat. Quis iſtum acutiſſimum ſenſum deſuiſſe Apoſtolo non miretur? Hoc quippe ille non vidit. &c. *Aug. Epiſt.* 105. *apud Alvar. Ibid. num.* 13.

Apoſtle ſhould not finde out this acute reaſon; for hee did not ſee it, &c. No, but flies to this, hee ſaith to Moſes, *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, &c. So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that ſheweth mercy.*

Alvar. de Auxil. l. 1. diſp. 5.

And that none of our Romiſh adverſaries may ſleight *Auſtine* in this point, *Alvarez* about the beginning of his Worke hath a Diſputation to ſhew what authority this Fathers judgement is of in the point of Grace, and Predeſtination. Hee ſhewes that not onely *Proſper*, but alſo many Biſhops of *Rome* did approve of *Auſtines* Doctrine concerning theſe points, and did determine it to be ſound and good.

Nec ſolus Proſper, ſed plures etiam ſummi Pontifices Doctrinam ejuſdem Auguſtini approbaverunt, & Catholicam eſſe decreverunt. *Alvar. Ibid. num. 3.*

And therefore in the teſtimony of *Auſtine*, wee have many teſtimonies, and ſuch as are irrefragable with thoſe, with whom now wee have to doe. But let us heare what ſome other late Writers of the Church of *Rome* doe ſay as to this point concerning Reprobation. *God from eternity* (ſaith Cardinall * *Cajetan*) *doth truly chuſe ſome, and reprobate others, doth love ſome, and hate others, in that from eternity his will is to vouchſafe ſome the helpe of his grace, whereby to bring them to eternall glory; and from eternity alſo his will is to leave ſome to themſelves, and not to afford them that gracious help, which he hath decreed to afford the Elect. And this is for God to hate, and to reprobate them; with which yet it doth well ſtand, that none is damned but by his owne Workes, becauſe neither the Sentence, nor Execution of damnation is before that ſuch Reprobates doe ſinne.*

* Deus ab æterno verè quoſdam eligit, & quoſdam reprobat, quoſdam diligit & quoſdam odio habet, pro quâto quibuſdam ab æterno vult conferre opem gratiæ ſuæ, & adjuvare illos uſque ad gloriam æternam; quoſdam autem ab æterno quoque vult permittere ſibi ipſis, nec adjuvare eos gratuito auxilio, quod electis decrevit conferre. Et hoc eſt Deum illos odio habere, hoc eſt Deum illos reprobare non ex operibus. Cum quo tamen ſtat quòd nullus damnatur niſi ex propriis operibus, nec ſententia ſiquidem, nec executio damnationis fit antequam hujuſmodi reprobi peccent. *Cajet. in Rom. 9. 13.*

* Jam hinc colligendum relinquit Apoſtolus argumento à figurâ ad rem ſignificatam, neque electionem hominũ, neque Reprobationem eſſe ex ullis operum meritis, ſed Deum ex ſolo voluntatis arbitrio alios eligere, alios autem reprobare. *Eſt. ad Rom. 9. 13.*

So alſo † *Eſtius* ſaith that the Apoſtle *Rom. 9.* doth teach, that *neither mens Election nor their Reprobation is from the Merits of*

workes, but that God by the meere pleasure of his wil doth chuse some, and Reprobate others.

And againe upon those words, *O man, who art thou that replieſt againſt God, &c.* hee ſaith that *the Apoſtles intent was to anſwer not ſo much the objection, as the cauſe of objecting. And that therefore he anſwers concerning the Will of God Electing, and Reprobating, and denies that the reaſon of it is to be inquired by man, who is Gods creature, and made by him: yea that by the example of a potter the Apoſtle ſhewes, that God doth this out of the liberty of his Will without any other reaſon.* And he addes that *Thomas Aquinas* did alſo thus rightly expound the words of the Apoſtle.

Studium fuit Apoſtoli non tam ad directionem reſpondere, quàm ad cauſam objiciendi. Concluſerat enim, Ergo cujus vult, miſeretur, &c. unde nata erat illa objectio,

Quid adhuc queritur, &c. Reſpondet itaque de voluntate Dei eligente, & reProbante, negans ejus rationem ab homine, qui creatura, & figmentum Dei eſt, ſcrutandam eſſe, imò ab exemplo figuli oſtendens Deum hoc facere pro libertate ſuæ voluntatis abſque aliâ ratione, ut rectè locum hunc *Thomas* expoſuit. *Eſt. ad Rom. 9. 20.*

* *Bradwardine*, who intituled the book which hee wrote, *of the cauſe of God*, is not to be omitted; Hee ſaith, *It's true, God doth not eternally puniſh any without his fault going before temporally, and abiding eternally: yet God did not eternally reprobate any, becauſe of ſinne, as a cauſe antecedently moving Gods Will.* What doe our Divines ſay, even ſuch as are of the more rigid ſort, as concerning this high and abſtruſe point of Reprobation, what (I ſay) doe they ſay more then is ſaid by theſe great and eminent Doctours of the Church of *Rome*, and before them by *Auſtine*, and before both him and them (as both hee and they conceived) by the Apoſtle *Paul* himſelfe? *The Decree of Reprobation* (ſaith Biſhop *Davenant*) *is not thus to be conceived, I will damne* Judas, *whether he believe, or not believe, repent or not repent; for this were contrary to the truth of the Evangelicall promiſes: but thus, I am abſolutely determined not to give unto* Judas *that ſpeciall grace, which would cauſe him to believe, and repent: and I am abſolutely purpoſed to permit him to incurre his own damnation by his voluntary abſtinacy, and finall impenitency.* And againe, *It muſt here firſt of all be conſidered, that Reprobatio æterna nihil ponit in reprobato* (that is, That eternall reprobation

* Verum eſt, quòd Deus æternaliter nullum punit ſine culpâ ſuâ temporaliter præcedente, & æternaliter permanente; non tamen propter culpam, tanquam propter cauſam antecedenter moventem voluntatem divinam, Deus quenquam æternaliter reprobavit. *Bradward. de Cauſ. Dei lib. 1. cap. ult.*

B. *Daven. Animadverſ. p. 352.*

Ibid pag. 356.

bation doth put nothing in the perſon that is reprobated) *It putteth onely in God a firme Decree of permitting ſuch perſons to fall into finall ſinne, and for it a firme decree of condemning them unto eternall puniſhment.* So both hee and diverſe other of our Engliſh Divines that were at the Synod of *Dort*, being ſent thither by King *James*, as they hold that * *Reprobation, which is the denying of election, doth put in God an immutable will not to have mercy on ſuch a perſon as is paſſed by, in reſpect of giving eternall life.* And that *foreſeene unbeliefe is not the cauſe of non election.* So withall they lay down this poſition, *God doth damne none, nor appoint unto Damnation, but in reſpect of ſinne.* So Doctor † *Ames* ſaith that it is too great a ſlander to ſay that according to our opinion God did immediately decree mens damnation, whether they be ſinners, or no. *Our opinion* (ſaith hee) *is this, that God did not chooſe ſome* (*as he did chuſe others*) *but did determine to let them abide in their ſinnes, and for thoſe ſinnes to ſuffer the puniſhment of juſt damnation; and that of this decree there is no cauſe to be found in thoſe that are not elected, which is not as much to be found in thoſe that are elected.*

* Reprobatio, quæ eſt electionis negatio, ponit immutabilem Dei voluntatem de non miſeratione talis perſonæ præteritæ, quoad ipſam donationem vitæ æternæ. *Suffr. Britan in 1. artic.* Præviſam infidelitatem eſſe cauſam non electionis falſum eſt. *Ibid.* Deus neminem damnat, aut damnationi deſtinat, niſi ex conſideratione peccati. *Ibid. Theſ. 5.* † Cur ſimplex appellent hoc decretum, non intelligimus, niſi velint Deum (ex noſtrâ ſententiâ) immediatè decreviſſe damnationem hominum, ſive peccatores fuerint, ſive non; quod eſt nimis ſimpliciter calumniari. *Ames. Animad. de Prædeſt. cap. 11. Sect. 6.* Noſtra ſententia eſt, Deum quoſdam homines non elegiſſe (ſicut alios elegit) ſed decreviſſe permittere, ut in peccatis ſuis manerent, & propter illa peccata juſtæ damnationis pœnam ſubirent hujuſmodi decreti nullam cauſam in non electis reperiri, quæ non ſimiliter in electis reperitur. *Ames. Ibid.*

Dicimus, & verè, deſtinatos eſſe damnationi non paucos antequam naſcantur.——Veruntamen non dicimus quenquam ad mortem ſubeundam deſtinatum eſſe niſi propter peccatum, nec ullo momento dicimus deſtinationem ipſam quoad actum deſtinantis præcedere præviſionem peccati. D. *Twiſſ. de Scient. med. lib. 1. digreſſ. 5.*

Thus alſo Doctor *Twiſſe*, *We ſay, and ſay truly* (ſaith hee) *that many are appointed unto damnation before they are borne.—Yet We doe not ſay, that any is appointed to ſuffer death but for ſinne, nor that the decree it ſelfe in reſpect of the act of him that decreeth, doth any one moment goe before the foreſight of ſinne.* I ſee nothing in theſe Aſſertions of our Divines, that hath any thing more horrid in it, then that is, which they of the Church of *Rome* before cited, doe aſſert, and yet ſome of theſe goe as high in the point of Pre-

Predestination (I thinke) as any others. a *Calvin* himselfe, as hee saith, *If wee cannot give a reason why God hath mercy on his own, but because so it pleaseth him: neither have we any cause why others are Reprobated, but his Will.* b So he saith withall, *If all by their condition be subject to condemnation, how can they, whom God doth predestinate unto destruction, complaine that he doth deale unjustly with them? Let all the sonnes of* Adam *come, let them contend and dispute with their Creator, because by his eternall providence, before they were borne, they were appointed to eternall misery. What will they be able to object against this plea, when God shall on the other side call them to a review of themselves? If all be taken out of the corrupt Masse, it is no wonder if they be subject to damnation. Let them not therefore accuse God of iniquity, if by his Eternall judgement they be appointed unto death, to which, whether they will or no, themselves doe see that they are led by their own nature of its own accord.* c And againe, *Although by Gods eternall Providence man is cast into that calamity, which doth befall him, yet he takes the matter of it from himselfe, and not from God, seeing for no other reason is he so undone, but because he did degenerate from that purity wherein God created him, and made himselfe vitious, impure and perverse.* d And againe, *we affirme that none do perish but by their own desert.* e And againe, *The cause of our damnation is in our selves.* Thus *Calvin* being heard speake for himselfe, it plainly appeares that hee by the decree of Reprobation makes God the author of mans damnation no otherwise then diverse Romanists themselves doe.

a Ergo si non possumus rationem assignare cur suos misericordiâ dignetur, nisi quoniam ita illi placet: neque etiam in aliis reprobandis aliud habebimus quàm ejus voluntatem. *Calv. Instit. lib. 3. c. 22. Sect. 11.*

b Quod si judicio mortis obnoxii sunt omnes naturali conditione, quos ad mortē Dominus prædestinat, de quâ, obsecro, ejus iniquitate ergas se conquerantur? Veniant omnes filii *Ad*am, cum suo creatore contēdant, ac disceptent, quòd æternâ illius providentiâ, ante suam generationem, perpetuæ calamitati addicti fuerint; quid obstrepere adversus defensionem poterunt, ubi Deus illos ad sui recognitionem contra vocabit? Ex corruptâ massâ si desumpti sunt omnes, non mirum si damnationi subjacent. Ne ergo Deum iniquitatis insimulent, si æterno ejus judicio morti destinati sint, ad quam à suâ ipsorum naturâ sponte se perduci, velint nolint, ipsi sentient. *Calvin. Instit. lib. 3. cap. 23. Sect. 3.*

c Tametsi æternâ Dei providentiâ ni eam, cui subjacet, calamitatem conditus est homo; à seipso tamen ejus materiam, non à Deo sumpsit, quando nullâ aliâ ratione sic perditus est, nisi quia à purâ Dei creatione in vitiosam & impuram perversitatem degeneravit. *Calv. Instit. lib. 3. cap. 23. Sect. 9. & Sect. 12.*

d Asserimus nullos perire immerentes. *Et de æter. Dei Prædest. pag. 976.* Damnationis nostræ culpa in nobis residet.

And thus alſo *Beza*, * *This* (ſaith hee) *is the ſum of* Pauls *anſwer, although God appoint either to love, or to hatred whom he will, without any reſpect of their qualifications, yet he is free from all injuſtice, becauſe betwixt Gods eternall decree, and the execution of it, there are ſubordinate cauſes, whereby God doth bring the elect unto ſalvation, and doth juſtly damne the Reprobate. For he ſaves the elect by mercy, and damnes the Reprobate by induration; ſo that they doe moſt fooliſhly, who confouned the decree of Reprobation with damnation, ſeeing that the cauſe of damnation is manifeſt, to wit, ſinne, but the Will of God is the onely cauſe of Reprobation. Therefore God doth wrong to neither, becauſe both deſerve deſtruction. For mercy ſhewes that the Elect were miſerable, and therefore worthy becauſe of ſinne to be deſtroyed; and induration preſuppoſeth perverſneſſe, in which the Reprobate are juſtly hardened.* The like he hath alſo againe a little after.

* Cæterùm hæc ſumma eſt reſponſionis *Pauli*, Quamvis Deus abſque ullo qualitatum reſpectu, amori deſtinet, & odio deſtinet, quoſcunque ipſi libuit, tamen procul eum abeſſe ab omni injuſtitiâ, quoniam inter æternum Dei decretum, & ejus decreti executionem ſunt cauſæ ſubordinatæ, quibus electos ad ſalutem adducit, & reprobos juſtè damnat. Electos n. ſervat per miſericordiam, reprobos damnat per indurationem, ut prorſus ineptè faciant, qui Reprobationis decretum cum damnatione confundunt; quum hujus cauſa manifeſta ſit, nempe peccatum, illius verò ſola Dei voluntas. Neutris igitur facit injuriam, quoniam utrique digni ſunt exitio. Miſericordia enim miſeros electos fuiſſe oſtendit, ac proinde dignos, qui propter peccatum perderentur: induratio verò perverſitatem præſupponit, in quâ juſtè indurantur reprobi. *Bezæ ad Rom. 9. 15. Similia etiam habet ad v. 17.*

And whereas * *Beza* ſaith that they doe not ſatisfie him, who by the lumpe which the Apoſtle ſpeakes of *Rom. 9. 12.* doe underſtand mankinde being corrupt; becauſe. 1. That terme he thinkes doth not well agree to man being created, much leſſe to him being already corrupted. And againe, if the Apoſtle had

* Qui maſſæ nomine humanum genus corruptum intelligunt, mihi non ſatisfaciunt in hujus loci explicatione. Primùm enim mihi videtur nomen illud informis materiæ, ne condito quidem humano generi, nedum jam corrupto, ſatis convenire. Deinde ſi genus humanum ut corruptum conſideraſſet Apoſtolus, non dixiſſet quædam vaſa ad decus, quædam ad dedecus facta; ſed potiùs quum omnia vaſa ad dedecus eſſet comparata, aliâ in illo dedecore relicta, alia verò ab hoc dedecore ad decus tranſlata. Poſtremò niſi *Paulus* ad ultimum uſque gradum conſcendat, non ſatisfecerit objectæ quæſtioni. Semper enim quæritur, iſta corruptio temeréne evenerit, an verò ſecundum Dei propoſitum, ac proinde difficultas eadem recurret. Dico igitur *Paulum* elegantiſſimâ iſtâ ſimilitudine adhibitâ ad ipſius *Adami* creationem alludere, & æternum uſque propoſitum Dei conſcendere, qui antequam humanum genus conderet, jam tum & in quibuſdam, quos novit, per miſericordiam ſervandis, & in quibuſdam, quos etiam novit, juſto judicio perdendis, gloriam ſuam illuſtrare, pro ſuo jure, & merâ voluntate decreverit. *Beza ad Rom. 3. 21.*

ſome

ſome Veſſells were made unto honour, and ſome unto diſhonoir; but ſeeing all Veſſels were fitted for diſhonour (all mankinde being corrupted) the Apoſtle would rather have ſaid that ſome were left in that diſhonour, and ſome tranſlated from it unto honour. Finally, except *Paul* goe up to the higheſt ſtep, the objection (hee thinkes) is not ſatisfied. For that ſtill it will be demanded, whether that corruption came as it happened, or according to Gods purpoſe; and ſo the ſame difficulty will remaine ſtill. Therefore *Paul* (hee ſaith) by that moſt elegant ſimilitude did allude unto *Adams* Creation, and did aſcend up even to Gods eternall purpoſe, who before he did create mankinde, did of his meere will and pleaſure determine to ſhew forth his glory in ſaving ſome through his mercy, and in deſtroying ſome by his juſt judgement.

This is no more then * *Eſtius* on *Rom.* 9. doth ſubſcribe unto. *In this diſputation* (ſaith hee) *the Apoſtle doth not ſuppoſe the lumpe corrupt, although that which the Apoſtle ſaith is true alſo of it according to* Aultines *opinion. For the Scriptures often uſing the compariſon of a lumpe, which the Potter doth faſten as he pleaſeth, ſpeakes of the lumpe abſolutely, not ſuppoſing any fault in it, but only conſidering the nature of it, whereby it is fit to be faſtned into any worke of the Potter. And therefore the Apoſtle doth not ſay, that the Potter of the ſame lumpe doth make one Veſſell unto honour, and leave another in diſhonour: but that of the ſame lumpe he doth make unto diſhonour. Neither doth he ſay, that the thing formed doth not ſay to him that formed it, Why haſt thou left me in the corrupt lumpe? but, Why haſt thou made me ſo? that is, a diſhonorable, and reprobate veſſell.*

* Non igitur in hâc diſputatione ſupponit Apoſtolus maſſam corruptam, licet etiam de ea ſecundum *Auguſtini* ſententiam, habet veritatem Apoſtoli ſententia. Nam Scriptura paſſim adhibens comparationē luti, quod pro ſuo libitu format figulus, de luto loquitur abſolutè, nullum ejus vitium ſupponens, ſed ſolam ejus naturam conſiderans, quâ formabile eſt ad omne opus figulinum. Unde nec ait Apoſtolus figulum ex eâdem maſſâ aliud vas facere in honorem, aliud in ignominiâ relinquere, ſed ex eâdem maſſâ facere in ignominiam. Neque dixit, figmentum ei qui ſe finxit non dicere, Cur me reliquiſti in maſſâ corruptâ? Sed, Cur me feciſti ſic? id eſt, vas ignominioſum, & reprobum. *Eſtius ad Rom.* 9. 21.

Here wee ſee *Eſtius* both approves of *Bezaes* interpretation, and alſo makes uſe of his reaſon for the confirming of it. And hee addes that the Apoſtle in that ſimilitude of a lumpe, and

and a Potter doth not allude to *Jer.* 18 6, but that rather there is a manifeſt alluſion to *Iſai.*45.9. *Woe unto him that ſtriveth with his Maker : Let the potſheard ſtrive with the potſheards of the Earth : ſhall the clay ſay to him that faſhioneth it, What makeſt thou ? or thy worke, he hath no hands ?* Which words (hee ſaith) doe verily ſignifie thus much, that God of his meere pleaſure doth ſo determine of mens eſtate either the one way, or the other, as a Potter doth make of clay what worke hee pleaſeth. And hitherto (hee ſaith) doth that belong, which followeth (*Iſai.*45. 10.) *Woe unto him that ſaith unto his Father, What begetteſt thou ? or to the woman, What haſt thou brought forth ? For* (ſaith hee) *what hath man deſerved, why his parents ſhould ingender him ſuch, or ſuch ?* And a little before by diverſe arguments he confutes thoſe, who thinke that the Apoſtle ſpeaking of † Reprobation doth ſuppoſe the lumpe of mankinde infected with originall ſinne. *If* (ſaith he) *thoſe things, which the Apoſtle delivers in this Chapter, be diligently conſidered it will fully appeare, that as well Reprobation as Election is abſolutely not of foreſeene merits. For* 1. *When he ſaith, neither having done any good, or evill, he excludes as well the evill action of* Eſau, *as the good action of* Jacob, *and conſequently as well the ill merit of Reprobation, as the good merit of Election.* 2. *To that queſtion, Is there unrighteouſneſſe with God ? he doth not anſwer, that therefore there is not, becauſe the*

Nec verum eſt, *Paulum* ad locum *Jeremiæ* (*Jer.* 18. 6.) alludere, quin potius manifeſta eſt alluſio ad *Iſai.* 45. Væ qui contradicit fictori ſuo, &c. Numquid dicit lutum,&c. Quæ ſanè verba ſignificant ita Deum pro mero ſuo beneplacito ſtatuere de rebus humanis in utramlibet partem,quomodo figulus ex luto facit opus quodcunque voluerit. Quo etiam pertinet quod ſequitur, Væ qui dicit,&c. Quod enim meritum hominis, ut parentes eum talem,vel tamen gignant ? *Eſtius. Ibid.*

† De Reprobatione non perinde omnes conſentiunt. Quidam enim dicunt Apoſtolum ſupponere maſſam humani generis infectam peccato originali, &c.

Verum ſi diligenter expendantur ea, quæ hoc cap. habet Apoſt. prorſus apparebit, tàm Reprobationem, quàm electionem abſolutè non ex ullis eſſe prævisis meritis. Nam, 1. cum dicit, Cum nihil egiſſent aut boni, aut mali, tam excludit actionem malum *Eſau*, quàm actionem bonam *Jacob*, & conſequenter tam malum meritum Reprobationis, quàm bonum meritum electionis. 2. Quæſtioni iſti, Numquid iniquitas, &c. non reſpondet, ideò non eſſe, quia tota maſſa peccato vitiata eſt, &c. ſed ita reſpondet, ut tam horum Reprobationem, quàm illorum electionem referat in ſolam Dei voluntatem, eo tandem dicto curioſum interrogatorem compeſcens, O homo tu quis, &c. 3. Comparatio illa de figulo ex eâdem maſſâ, &c. maſſæ corruptæ hypotheſim excludit. Hic enim profectò nihil in maſſâ ſupponitur, niſi quòd ſit indifferens, & formabilis ad utrumque——In hanc ſententiam, &c. Lamb. Hugo. Vid. S. Thom. Cajetan. Lyran. Tileman. Perer. &c. *Eſtius ad Rom. 9.* 13.

Whole lumpe is depraved by ſinne, &c. but he anſwers ſo, as that he refers as well the Reprobation of theſe, as the election of thoſe, unto the ſole Will of God, and ſo repreſſes the curious inquirer, O man, who art thou, &c. 3. That compariſon of a Potter of the ſame lumpe making one veſſell unto honour, and another unto diſhonour, doth exclude the ſuppoſition of a corrupt lumpe. For here verily is nothing ſuppoſed in the lumpe, but that it is indifferent, and may be faſhioned both the one way, and the other.

Thus this learned Papiſt goes as farre in the point both of Election and of Reprobation as any Proteſtant (that I know) whatſoever. Neither would he have us thinke that he goes alone; for hee cites many, as *Lombard, Hugo de S. Victore, Aquinas, Cajetan, Lyra, Titleman*, and *Pererius*, as being of the ſame opinion with him, and interpreting the words of the Apoſtle in the ſame manner. And this (I ſuppoſe) may ſuffice to vindicate the Doctrine of Proteſtants (even ſuch as goe higheſt in this point) as touching Reprobation.

Now for the Scriptures objected againſt us, the firſt, *viz. Wiſ.* 1. 13. is not Canonicall. *Hierome* brandes that booke called *the the Wiſdome of Solomon*, as falſly intituled; and ſaith, that it is no where to be found among the Hebrewes (to whom the Oracles of God were committed, *Rom.* 3. 2.) and that the ſtyle doth ſmell of Greeke eloquence, and that ſome ancient writers affirme it to be the worke of *Philo* a Jew. *Therefore* (ſaith he) *as the Church doth read indeed the Bookes of* Judith, Tobie *and the* Maccabees, *but doth not receive them amongſt the Canonicall Scriptures: ſo alſo doth it reade theſe two volumes* (viz. Eccleſiaſticus, and the wiſdome of *Solomon*) *for the edifying of the people, but not for the confirming of Eccleſiaſticall Doctrines.*

Fertur, &c. Et alius Pſeudepigraphus, qui Sapientia Solomonis inſcribitur.— Apud Hebræos nuſquam eſt: quin & ipſe ſtylus Græcam eloquentiam redolet, & nonnulli Scriptorum veterum hunc eſſe Judæi Philonis affirmant. Sicut ergo Judith, & Tobiæ, & Maccabæorum libros legit quidem Eccleſia, ſed eos inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipit: ſic & hæc duo volumina (*Eccleſiaſticum, & Librum Sapientiæ*) legit ad ædificationem plebis, non ad authoritatem Eccleſiaſticorum dogmatum confirmandam. *Hier. præfat. in Proverb.*

But ſuppoſe it were Canonicall, the place alledged is anſwered to our hand by one of the Roman Church, viz. *Alvarez*: when it is ſaid, *God made not death*, the meaning (hee ſaith) is, that God doth not primarily of it ſelfe intend the

Senſus hujus loci eſt, quod Deus nō intendit perſe primò mortem alicujus, ſed ratione alterius majoris boni conjuncti. Secūdò explicatur locus iſte de morte, quantū ad ejus cauſā, ſcil. peccatū &c.

death of any but in reſpect of ſome other great good that is joyned with it. And againe, that place (hee ſaith) is expounded of death in reſpect of the cauſe, to wit, ſinne. Theſe expoſitions of the place doe free the Doctrine of Proteſtants from ſuffering any prejudice by it, were the authority of it greater then indeed it is. The next place is that, 1 *Tim.* 2.4. *Who will have all men to be ſaved, &c.* *Auſtine* gives diverſe interpretations of thoſe words. Firſt, thus, that the meaning is, that God will have all to be ſaved that are ſaved, and that none but ſuch as hee will ſave, can bee ſaved. Secondly, this that by *all men* are meant men of all ſorts, how ever diſtinguiſhed, Kings and private perſons, noble and ignoble, &c. This hee ſhewes to be agreeable both to the Context, and alſo to the phraſe of Scripture, *Luke* 11.42. *You tithe Mint, and Rue, and every Herbe*, i.e. every kinde of Herbe. This latter expoſition of the Apoſtles words *Alvarez* ſaith is alſo followed by *Fulgentius*, *Beda*, and *Anſelme*. The ſame *Alvarez* relates two other interpretations, which *Auſtine* gives of theſe words, *viz.* firſt this, God will have all men to be ſaved, that is, hee makes men to will, or deſire that all may be ſaved, as the Spirit is ſaid to make interceſſion for us, *Rom.* 8. 26. that is, makes us to make interceſſion or ſupplication, &c.

Debemus ita intelligere, &c. tanquam diceretur, Nullum hominem fieri ſalvum, niſi quem ſalvum fieri ipſe voluerit, &c. Aut certè ſic dictum eſt &c. ut omnes homines omne genus hominum intelligamus per quaſcunque differentias diſtributum, reges, privatos, nobiles, ignobiles, *&c. Enchir. cap.* 103.

Alvar. de Auxil. diſput. 33.

Deus vult, *i.e.* facit ut homines velint, omnes ſalvos fieri, &c. Sic explicat S. *Aug. de corrept. & grat. cap.* 15.

*Qui omnes homines vult ſalvos fieri] h.e. vult & facit pios homines velle ſeu deſiderare omnium ſalutem.——Quamvis Deus non velit omnes ſalvos facere, ſed ſolos electos: vult tamen omnes ſalvos fieri, ſcil. per nos, & quantum in nobis eſt, dum præcipit ut omnium ſalutem quæramus, & hoc ipſum ſtudium in nobis operatur.——Hanc expoſitionem præ cæteris amplectimur. *Eſt. ad* 1 *Tim.* 2.4.

* *Eſtius* upon the place doth embrace this Expoſition before any other. *VVho will have all men to be ſaved*] *that is* (ſaith hee) *He willeth, and maketh godly men to deſire the ſalvation of all.——Though God will not ſave all, but onely the Elect; yet he will have all to be ſaved, to wit, by us, as much as in us lies, in that he commands us to ſeek the ſalvation of all, and this deſire and indeavour he workes in us.——This Expoſition wee embrace rather then any of the reſt.*

The

The other Expoſition which * *Alvarez* relates, is, that the Apoſtle ſpeakes of *Gods antecedent will*. Thus (hee ſaith) *Auſtine* doth expound it in diverſe places, and for this Expoſition hee alſo cites *Damaſcene*, *Proſper*, *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, *Aquinas*, as alſo *Chryſoſtome* and *Ambroſe*, and ſaith that it is common among the Doctors. Now in the next Diſputation hee tels us that *Gods antecedent Will* is that, which reſpects the object ſimply conſidered, and by it ſelfe: and that this will is called *antecedent*, not becauſe it goes before the good, or ill uſe of our will, as ſome thinke, but becauſe it goes before that will, whereby God reſpects the object conſidered with ſome adjunct, which is the conſequent, and latter conſideration of it. *If* (ſaith hee) *the ſalvation of the Reprobate be conſidered ſimply by it ſelfe, ſo God doth will it: but if it be conſidered, as it hath adjoyned the privation, or want of a greater good, to wit, the univerſall good of manifeſting Gods Juſtice in the Reprobate, and of cauſing his Mercy the more to ſhine forth in the Elect, ſo God doth not will it. And in this reſpect were affirmed, that God by a conſequent Will doth not will that all ſhall be ſaved, but only ſuch as are predeſtinate.*

* Quarta explicatio docet loqui Apoſtolum de voluntate Dei antecedente, quæ eſt voluntas ſigni, & voluntas ſecundum quid, ut dicitur diſput: ſequenti. Hanc explicationem etiam tradit S. Aug. lib. ad art. ubi falſò impoſitos, art. 2. & cap. 15. de corrept. & grat. & c. *Alvar. ubi ſupra.* Voluntas Dei antecedens eſt, quæ fertur in objectum aliquod abſolutè conſideratum, & ſecundum ſe; dicitur autem hæc voluntas antecedens, non quia antecedit bonum, vel malum uſum noſtri arbitrii, ut arbitrantur auctores primæ ſententiæ, ſed quia antecedit voluntatem quâ Deus fertur in objectum conſideratum cum aliquo adjuncto, quæ eſt conſequens, & poſterior conſideratio ejus.——Si conſideretur ſalus reproborum ſecundum ſe, & abſolutè, ſic eſt à Deo volita: ſi autem conſideretur, ſecundum quod habet adjunctam privationem, aut carentiam majoris boni, *viz.* boni univerſi manifeſtationis juſtitiæ divinæ in reprobis, & majoris ſplendoris miſericordiæ ejus in electis, ſic non eſt volita à Deo. Et ſecundum hoc aſſerimus, quòd voluntate conſequente Deus non velit omnes ſalvos fieri, ſed ſolùm prædeſtinatos. *Alvar. de Auxil. Diſput.* 34. *num.* 3.

Now take any of all theſe foure Explications of the Apoſtles words, wherein hee ſaith, that *God will have all men to be ſaved* (as for my part I like beſt either the ſecond, or the laſt) take any of them, I ſay, and the Apoſtles words are nothing againſt that which Proteſtants hold concerning Reprobation. As for that of *Peter*, that *God is not willing that any ſhould periſh*, 2 Pet. 3. 9. *Bellarmine* himſelfe expounds both it, and the former place, *viz.* 1 *Tim.* 2. 4. of that Will of God, which Divines call *Gods Antecedent will*. Now what that *Antecedent*

Verum eſt, Deum velle omnes ſalvos fieri voluntate illâ, quam rectè Theologi antecedentem vocant. *Bell. de grat. & lib. arb. lib.* 2. *cap.* 3.

Will of God is we have ſeene even now out of *Alvarez* : if *Bellarmine* did underſtand it otherwiſe (as *Alvarez* notes that ſome did) hee is confuted by *Alvarez* in the place above cited. Where hee alſo cites *Auſtine* ſaying, *Many are not ſaved, not becauſe they will not, but becauſe God will not : which Without all controverſie is manifeſted in young children* : whence he inferrs that *the condition, Which is included in Gods Antecedent will, whereby he will have all men to be ſaved, is not this, if they will, and if they doe not hinder it.*

Multi ſalvi non fiunt, non quia ipſi nolint, ſed quia Deus non vult ; quod abſque ullâ controverſiâ manifeſtatur in parvulis. *Aug. apud Alvar. diſput.* 34. *num.* 5. Ergo conditio, quæ includitur in voluntate antecedente, quâ Deus vult omnes homines ſalvos fieri, non eſt iſta, ſi ipſi voluerint, aut per eos non ſteterit. *Alvar. Ibid.*

Veriſſimum eſt, non fieri omnes ſalvos quia ipſi nolunt : nam ſi vellent, Deus eis utique non deeſſet. Cæterùm nemo vult ſalvus fieri, niſi Deus præveniendo, & preparando voluntatem, faciat eum velle : cur autem Deus non faciat omnes velle, quis novit ſenſum Domini ? & quis conſiliarius ejus fuit? *Bell. loco proximè citato.*

And *Bellarmine* himſelfe alſo, though he ſay, *It is moſt true, that all are not ſaved, becauſe they will not : for if they would, God would not be Wanting unto them.* Yet immediately hee addes, *But none can have a will to be ſaved, except God by preventing and preparing the will, make him to Will it. And why God doth not make all to will this, who hath knowne the mind of the Lord ? and who hath been his Counſellour ?* (Rom. 11. 34.) The laſt place of Scripture, which the Marqueſſe objecteth, is Ezech. 33. 11. *As I live, ſaith the Lord, I delight not in the death of a ſinner.*

Intelligitur de morte ſpirituali, quæ eſt per peccatum. Hanc enim non vult Deus ſed ſolùm permittit. Colligitur hæc explicatio ex contextu : ait enim, ſed magis ut convertatur, & vivat. Si autem explicetur de morte ſecundâ, ſcil. de damnatione æternâ, dicendum eſt, quòd Deus non vult hanc mortem alicui inferre, niſi ſuppoſito peccato, ut diſp. 109. & 110. patebit. *Alvar. de Auxil. diſp.* 33. *num.* 5.

Now to this alſo we have *Alvarez* to anſwer for us, *viz.* firſt that it is meant of ſpirituall death, which is by ſinne. Which God doth only permit, but doth not delight in it. And this Explication hee ſaith, is confirmed by the words following, *but rather that he be converted, and live.* And if it be expounded of the ſecond death, which is eternall damnation, the meaning, hee ſaith, is, that God will not inflict this upon any but for ſinne.

But

But though God will not inflict damnation upon the Reprobate, but for ſinne; yet this ſame *Alvarez* (as I have ſhewed abundantly before) and ſo other Writers of the Church of *Rome* doe tell us, that God by his eternall Decree of Reprobation of his meere Will, and Pleaſure, doth determine to ſuffer the Reprobate to ſinne, and ſo to damne them for it. And thus now I have made it appeare (I hope) ſufficiently, that by the conſent of the Romaniſts themſelves the Scriptures alledged are not repugnant to the Doctrine of Proteſtants concerning Reprobation: neither (I thinke) will the Fathers, whom the Marqueſſe citeth, be againſt it. The firſt of them is *Auſtine*, who (as hath before been ſhewed) is as much for us as we neede deſire. He is here produced againſt us, but ſo as that I know not eaſily how to finde what he ſaith. For onely *li.* 1. *de Civit. Dei* is cited, but no Chapter, whereas there are no leſſe then 36. in that booke: this is a ſtrange kinde of citing Authors, but the fault may be in the Printer, or in ſome other, and not in the Marqueſſe. As for *Cyprian*, who is next cited, I ſee not any thing in the place pointed at, which is to this purpoſe, except this, *Seeing it is written, God made not death, nor doth he rejoyce in the deſtruction of the living, ſurely he that would not have any to periſh, deſires that ſinners may come to Repentance, and that by Repentance they may returne unto life againe.* Now that which *Cyprian* here alledgeth, *viz. God made not death*, &c. I have ſhewed before by the teſtimony of *Hierome* to be no Canonicall Scripture, nor of ſufficient force to decide any point of controverſie: as alſo that if it were, yet by the acknowledgement of *Alvarez* it makes not againſt Gods Decree of Reprobation, which wee maintaine. It hath alſo beene ſhewed before in what ſenſe *God would have none to periſh, viz.* by his Antecedent Will, with which yet will ſtand the Decree of Reprobation, as we hold it; which likewiſe hath been ſhewed, and that from both *Bellarmine*, and from *Alvarez* alſo. And that *God deſires ſinners may come to Repentance, and ſo to life*, Proteſtants, (that I know) doe not deny, though they hold that God doth give (and ſo from all eternity did purpoſe to give) Repen-

Nam cum Scriptum ſit, Deus mortem non fecit, nec lætatur in perditione vivorum, utique qui neminem vult perire, cupit peccatores pœnitentiam agere, & per pœnitentiam denuò ad vitam redire. *Cypr. lib.* 4. *Epiſt.* 2. *vel edit. Pamel. Epiſt.* 52.

tance unto ſome, and not to others, as hee pleaſeth; which I have alſo ſhewed to be acknowledged by *Bellarmine*, *Alvarez*, *Eſtius*, and others of the Church of *Rome*. And it is moſt cleare by that of the Apoſtle, *If God peradventure will give them Repentance*, 2 Tim. 2. 25. and that, *He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will, he hardneth*. Rom. 9. 18.

The third and laſt Father, who is here alledged, is *Ambroſe de Cain & Abel lib.* 2. but what Chapter, (whereas there are ten in that Booke) is not mentioned. Now I finde that *Chap.* 3. hath ſomething, which probably was aimed at by the Marqueſſe, *viz.* this, *Chriſt therefore offered the helpe of healing unto all, that whoſoever periſheth, may aſcribe the cauſe of his death to himſelfe, who when he had a remedy, whereby he might eſcape, would not be cured. And that Chriſts mercy towards all might be made manifeſt, in that they that periſh, doe periſh by their own negligence, but they that are ſaved, are freed according to Chriſts ſentence, who will have all men to be ſaved, and to come to the acknowledgement of the truth.* Now I know no Proteſtant but hee will aſſent unto this, that *whoſoever periſh, muſt aſcribe the cauſe to themſelves, and that they periſh through their own default.* I have before cited *Calvin* aſſerting thus much, *That none doe periſh without their deſert.* But this aſſertion of his is very well conſiſtent with his Doctrine about Reprobation, as I have ſhewed by the teſtimonies of diverſe famous Writers of the Church of *Rome*. And whereas *Ambroſe* ſaith, *that ſuch as periſh, had a remedy, whereby they might eſcape, and that they therefore periſh, becauſe they would not be cured.* No Proteſtants, (I ſuppoſe) will deny, but that ſuch as periſh through unbeliefe, if they did believe, ſhould be ſaved: but yet nevertheleſſe not Proteſtants onely, but Papiſts alſo (as I have ſhewed) doe hold, that God from all eternity did decree and purpoſe to give faith unto ſome, and not unto others, and that meerely of his own will and pleaſure. And that therefore according to *Anſtine* (whoſe words are cited before) the prime and ſupreme cauſe why ſome are not ſaved, is

Ideo omnibus opem ſanitatis detulit, ut quicunque perierit, mortis ſuæ cauſas ſibi aſcribat, qui curari noluit, cum remedium haberet, quo poſſet evadere: Chriſti autem manifeſta in omnes prædicetur miſericordia, eò quòd ii qui pereunt, ſuâ pereant negligentiâ, qui autem ſalvantur, ſecundum Chriſti ſententiâ liberentur, qui omnes homines vult ſalvos fieri, & in agnitionem veritatis venire. *Amb. de Cain & Abel. l.* 2. *c.* 3.

Aſſerimus nullos perire immerentes. *Calv. Inſtit. li.* 3. *c.* 23. *Sect* 12.

is not becauſe they will not, but becauſe God will not. For that which *Ambroſe* hath in the laſt place, *who will have all men to be ſaved*, &c. enough hath beene ſaid before to ſhew, that in the judgement of *Auſtine*, and diverſe Romaniſts, it is nothing againſt the abſolute decree of Reprobation; and ſo I have done with this point.

In the next place the Marqueſſe ſpeakes of a mans aſſurance of his ſalvation, ſaying, that Proteſtants hold that a man ought to aſſure himſelfe of it; and to prove the contrary, which they of the Roman Church doe hold, he alledgeth 1 *Cor.*9.27. ſaying, S. *Paul* was not aſſured, but that whileſt he Preached to others, he himſelfe might become a caſt-away. And *Rom.*11.20. *Thou ſtandeſt in the Faith: be not high minded, but feare, &c. leſt thou alſo mayeſt be cut off.* And Phil.2.12. *Worke out your own ſalvation with fear and trembling.* *Page 66. & 67.*

Anſw. Concerning this point, Proteſtants hold, 1. That a Chriſtian may be aſſured of his ſalvation. 2. That a Chriſtian ought to labour for this aſſurance. For the former of theſe poſitions wee have diverſe places of Scriptures. As firſt that famous place *Rom.*8. 35,36, 37, 38, 39. *Who ſhall ſeparate us from the love of Chriſt? ſhall Tribulation, or Diſtreſſe, or Perſecution, &c. Nay in all theſe things we are more then conquerours through Him that loved us. For I am perſwaded, that neither Death, nor Life, nor Angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things preſent, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other Creature, ſhall be able to ſeparate us from the love of God, which is in Chriſt Jeſus our Lord.* So alſo that 2 Cor.5.1. *We know then if our earthly houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, We have a building of God, an houſe not made with hands, eternall in the Heavens,* And *v.*6, 7, 8. *Therefore we are alwayes confident, knowing that whiles we are here in the body, We are abſent from the Lord. For we walke by faith, and not by ſight. We are confident, I ſay, and willing rather to be abſent from the body, and to be preſent with the Lord.* And that Phil. 1. 21. *To me to live is Chriſt, and to die is gaine.* And that 2 Tim. 4. 18. *The Lord ſhall deliver me from every evill Work, and will preſerve me to his Heavenly Kingdom.* And in the ſame Chapter *v.*6,7, 8. *I am now ready to be offered, and my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finiſhed*

finiſhed my courſe, I have kept the faith: henceforth is laid up for me the crown of righteouſneſſe, &c. So alſo S. *Peter, Bleſſed be the God and Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us againe unto a lively hope, through the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reſerved in Heaven for us.* 1 Pet. 1. 3, 4. This hope, which believers have, or may have of ſalvation, is *a lively hope*; it is *a hope, that maketh not aſhamed.* Rom. 5. 5. becauſe they are ſure to obtaine that which they hope for, and ſhall not be diſappointed of it. Hence it is alſo that believers *rejoyce with joy unſpeakable, and full of glory*; 1 Pet. 1. 8. becauſe they know *they ſhall receive the end of their faith, even the ſalvation of their ſoules.* v. 9.

Wee have alſo Fathers to teſtifie this truth; *There flouriſheth with us* (ſaith *Cyprian*) *the ſtrength of hope, and the firmneſs of faith; and amongſt the very ruines of the decaying world the minde is raiſed up, and virtue is unmoveable, and patience is ever joyfull, and the ſoule is alwayes ſecure and confident of her God.* And immediatly hee confirmes this by that of the Prophet *Habakkuk*, *Although the fig-three ſhall not bloſſome, &c. yet I will rejoyce in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my ſalvation.* Hab. 3. 17, 18.

Viget apud nos ſpei robur, & firmitas fidei, & inter ipſas ſeculi labentis ruinas erecta mens eſt, & immobilis virtus, & nunquam non læta patientia, & de Deo ſuo ſemper anima ſecura: ſicut per prophetam Spiritus S. loquitur, &c. Ego autem in Domino exultabo, & gaudebo in Deo ſalvatore meo. *Cypian. ad Demetrian.*

So againe the ſame Father, * *what place is there here for anxiety and carefulneſſe? who in the midſt of theſe things can be fearfull and ſad, except he want hope and faith? It is for him to fear death, that would not go unto Chriſt: it is for him to be unwilling to go to Chriſt, that doth not believe that he doth begin to reigne with Chriſt. For it is written, The juſt ſhall live by faith. If thou beeſt juſt, and*

* Quis hîc anxietatis & ſollicitudinis locus eſt? quis inter hæc trepidus & mœſtus eſt, niſi cui ſpes & fides deeſt? Ejus eſt enim mortem timere, qui ad Chriſtum nolit ire: ejus eſt ad Chriſtum nolle ire, qui ſe non credat cum Chriſto incipere regnare. Scriptum eſt enim, juſtum fide vivere. Si juſtus es, & fide vivis, ſi verè in Deum credis, cur non cum Chriſto futurus, & de Domini pollicitatione ſecurus, quòd ad Chriſtum voceris amplecteris, & quòd diabolo careas, gratularis? ——— Deus de hoc mundo recedentibus immortalitatem atque æternitatem pollicetur, & tu dubitas: hoc eſt Deum omnino non noſſe; hoc eſt Chriſtum credentium Dominum & magiſtrum peccato incredulitatis offendere; hoc eſt in Eccleſiâ conſtitutum fidem in domo fidei non habere. *Cypr. de mortalit.*

doeſt

doeſt live by faith, if thou doeſt truly believe in God, ſeeing thou ſhalt be with Chriſt, and art ſure of Gods promiſe, why doeſt thou not embrace this that thou art called unto Chriſt, and art glad that thou art freed from the Devill?——God doth promiſe immortality and eternity to thoſe that depart out of this life, and thou doubteſt: this is not at all to know God: this is to offend Chriſt, the Lord and Maſter of Believers, with the ſinne of unbeliefe: this is to be in the Church, the houſe of faith, and yet to have no faith. Here we ſee how earneſt *Cyprian* is to prove that Chriſtians may, yea ought to be confident againſt the feare of death, and that becauſe they may and ought to be aſſured of the life to come.

Thus alſo * *Auſtine, I believe* (ſaith hee) *him that promiſeth; The Saviour ſpeaketh, the truth promiſeth, he hath ſaid unto me, He that heareth my words, and believeth him that ſent me, hath eternall life, and is paſſed from death to life, and ſhall not come into condemnation. I have heard the words of my Lord, I have believed. Now whereas I was an unbeliever, I am made a Believer, as he hath ſaid, I am paſſed from death to life, I come not into condemnation, not by my preſumption, but by his promiſe.*

* Credo promittenti, Salvator loquitur, veritas pollicetur, ipſe dixit mihi, Qui audit verba mea, & credit ei qui miſit me, habet vitam æternam, & tranſitum facit de morte in vitam, & in judicium non veniet; Ego audivi verba Dmmini mei, credidi. Jam infidelis cum eſſem, factus ſum fidelis, ſicut ipſe monuit, tranſii à morte ad vitam, ad judicium non venio, non præſumptione meâ, ſed ipſius promiſſione. *Aug. tract. 22. in Joh.*

To this purpoſes alſo † *Bernard, The Sun of Righteouſneſſe ariſing* (ſaith hee) *the myſtery concerning the predeſtinate, and thoſe that ſhall be made bleſſed, which was ſo long hid, beginnes after a ſort to come up out of the depth of eternity, whiles every one being called by feare, and juſtified by love* (that is, by Faith working through love, as hee ſaid a little before) *doth aſſure himſelfe that he is of the number of the bleſſed. Knowing that whom he hath juſtified them he hath alſo glorified. For Why? Hee heares that he is called, when he is moved with feare; he perceives that he is juſtified, when he is filled with love: and ſhall he doubt of his being glorified?*

† Sic ad ortum ſolis juſtitiæ, Sacramentum abſconditum à ſeculis de prædeſtinatis, & beatificandis, emergere quodammodo incipit ex abyſſo æternitatis, dũ quiſque vocatus per timorem, juſtificatus per amorem, præſumit ſe quoque eſſe de numero beatorum; ſciens nimirum quia quos juſtificavit, illos & magnificavit. Quid enim? Audit ſe vocari, cum timore concutitur, ſentit & juſtificari, cũ amore perfunditur, & de magnificatione diffidet? *Ber. Epiſt. 107.*

Habes homo hujus arcani indicem ſpiritum juſtificantem, eoque ipſo teſtificantem ſpiritui tuo quod filius Dei & ipſe ſis.

And againe, *Thou haſt O man* (ſaith hee) *the juſtifying ſpirit a revealer of this ſecret, and ſo teſtifying unto thy ſpirit, that thou alſo art the Son of God. Acknowledge the counſell of God in thy juſtification.*——*For thy preſent juſtification is both a revelation of Gods Counſell, and alſo a certaine preparation unto future glory. Or truly predeſtination it ſelfe is rather a preparation, and juſtification is rather an appropinquation unto it.*

Agnoſce conſilium Dei in juſtificatione tui——Præſens namque juſtificatio tui, & Divini eſt conſilii revelatio, & quædam ad futuram gloriam præparatio. Aut certè prædeſtinatio ipſa potius præparatio eſt, juſtificatio autem magis jam appropinquatio. *Bern. Ibid;*

Juſtus autem quis eſt, niſi qui amanti ſe Deo vicem rependit amoris? Quod non fit niſi revelante Spiritu per fidem homini æternum Dei propoſitum ſuper ſuâ ſalute futurâ. Quæ

And againe, *Who is righteous, but he that doth requite Gods love with love againe? which is not done but when the ſpirit by Faith doth reveale unto a man Gods eternall purpoſe concerning his future ſalvation. Which revelation ſurely is no other thing but the infuſion of ſpirituall grace, by which the deeds of the fleſh are mortified, and ſo a man is prepared for that Kingdome, which fleſh and blood do not poſſeſſe, receiving together by one ſpirit both this, that he is aſſured that he is loved, and alſo this, that hee doth love againe, that ſo he may not be ungratefull to him, of whom he is loved.*

ſanè revelatio non eſt aliud quàm infuſio gratiæ ſpiritualis, per quam dum facta carnis mortificantur, homo ad regnum præparatur, quod caro & ſanguis non poſſident, ſimul accipiens in uno ſpiritu & unde ſe preſumat amatum, & unde redamet, ne gratis amatus ſit. *Bernard. Ibid.*

Thus both Scriptures and Fathers teſtifie that Chriſtians may be aſſured of their ſalvation. And that this aſſurance may be had, may be proved alſo by all that hath beene ſaid before concerning the ſtability of Faith once had, and the certainty of perſevering in the eſtate of grace, if a man be once in it. For hence it followeth, that if a man can be aſſured that hee is in the eſtate of Grace, hee may alſo be aſſured of his ſalvation. Now that he may be aſſured of his being in the ſtate of grace ſome of the Romiſh Church, and that ſince *Luthers* time, have maintained, as namely *Catharinus*, and the Author of the Booke called *Enchiridium Colonienſe*, both which are mentioned in this reſpect by

by *Bellarmine*. And becauſe the Councell of Trent *Seſſ. 6. c. 9.* doth ſeeme to determine the contrary, therefore *Eiſingrenius* hath written a whole booke to ſhew that the determination of the Councell is not indeed againſt this, that a man may be aſſured that he hath true grace in him. The booke I have ſeene and read many yeeres agoe, though now I have it not; And I remember he holds that a man may be as ſure that hee hath true grace, and that his ſinnes are forgiven, as hee is ſure that twice two make foure, and that the whole is greater then a part, and as hee is ſure of thoſe things which hee ſees with his eyes, and feeles with his hands. That a man may have this aſſurance of his preſent eſtate the Scripture plainly ſhewes, 1 *Joh.*3.14. *We know that we are paſſed from death to life, becauſe we love the Brethren.* *Bellar. de Juſtif. l. 3. c. 3.*

Whereupon ſayes * *Auſtine*, *Let none aske man, let every one returne unto his own heart, if there he can finde brotherly love let him be ſecure that he is paſſed from death to life.* So Rom. 8. 16. *The Spirit himſelfe doth beare Witneſſe with our ſpirits, that we are the ſonnes of God.* Upon which words † *Cajetan* ſaith thus, *By this teſtimony we ſee clearly, that we muſt believe that we are the ſons of God.* So alſo 1 *Joh.*3.24. *Hereby we know that he* (viz. Chriſt) *abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us.* And 1 Cor.2.12. *We have received the ſpirit of God, that we may know the things that are freely given unto us of God. Bellarmine* ſayes this place is not meant of the knowledge of Gods benefits, which belong unto this or that man in particular, but of the knowledge of thoſe benefits, which God hath prepared for his Elect, as the inheritance and glory of the Kingdome of Heaven. But if the Apoſtle ſpeakes onely of our knowing what good things God hath prepared in generall for the Elect, what is this more then appertaines to the very Devils? for they know that God hath prepared Heaven, and happineſſe for the Elect; *Cajetan* therefore is more ingenuous,

* Nemo interroget hominem, redeat unuſquiſque ad cor ſuum, ſi ibi invenerit charitatem fraternam, ſecurus ſit quia tranſit à morte ad vitam. *Aug. tract. 5. in 1 Joh.*

† Ex hoc teſtimonio clarè videmus, credendum nobis eſſe quòd ſumus filii Dei. *Cajc. in Rom.* 8.16.

Non loquitur Apoſtolus de notitiâ beneficiorum Dei, quæ in particulari ad hunc, aut illum pertinent, ſed de notitiâ beneficiorum, quæ Deus præparavit electis ſuis, qualia ſunt inprimis hæreditas, & gloria regni cælorum. *Bell. de Juſtif. lib. 3. cap. 9.*

Spiritus S. infuſus Apoſtolis cauſavit in illis notitiam certam donorum Dei in eiſdem ——Apoſtoli certam habebant notitiam, quòd fides, ſpes, charitas, & alia dona gratis data eis erant à Deo. *Cajet. ad 1 Cor. 2. 12.*

expounding it of the holy Ghoſt infuſed into the Apoſtles, and cauſing them certainly to know the gifts of God, that were in them. *The Apoſtles* (ſaith hee) *had a certaine knowledge, that Faith, Hope, Charity, and other gifts, were freely given unto them of God.* To adde but one place more, *viz.* that 1 *Joh.* 5. 13. *These things have I written unto you that believe on the name of the Son of God, that you may know that ye have eternall life.* True (ſayes *Bellarmine*) the Apoſtle ſaith indeed, *These things I write unto you that believe, that you may know that you have eternall life:* but hee doth not ſay, *These things I write unto you, that you may know that you believe, as you ought to believe.* But (ſay I) the Apoſtle here did ſuppoſe that they that truly believe, may know that they doe ſo; for otherwiſe how ſhould they that believe, know that therefore they have life eternall, except they firſt know that they doe believe?

Ait quidem, Hæc ſcribo vobis qui creditis, ut ſciatis, quia vitam habetis æternam: ſed non ait, Hæc ſcribo vobis, ut ſciatis vos habere fidem, qualis requiritur. *Bell. de Iuſtif. lib. 1. cap. 11.*

Now for the Scriptures objected againſt us, that 1 *Cor.* 9. 27. *Leſt having preached to others, I my ſelfe ſhould be a caſt-away,* cannot be ſo underſtood, as that *Paul* was uncertaine either of his preſent juſtification, or of his future glorification; for that will not conſiſt with many other ſayings of his before cited. The meaning therefore is onely this, that *Pauls* care was that his Preaching and his converſation might be ſuitable, and that the one might not confound the other. The word here rendred *caſt-away*, and 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *reprobate*, is neither here nor there taken in oppoſition to *elect*, but is as much as *reproved*, ſo the word properly doth import; as without the private Particle it ſignifies *approved*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 19. That *Rom.* 11. 20. *Thou ſtandeſt by faith, be not high minded, but fear*, is nothing againſt aſſurance of ſalvation, which doth well conſiſt with feare, *viz.* ſuch a feare as is oppoſit to high-mindedneſſe; this feare making us keepe cloſe unto God, and not to depart from him, *Jer.* 32. 40. And whereas it is ſaid *Rom.* 11. 22. *Leſt thou alſo mayſt* (or as wee reade it, *otherwiſe thou alſo ſhalt*) *be cut off*, it is ſpoken by the Apoſtle

ἀδόκιμος. δόκιμοι.

Apoſtle to the Church of *Rome*, and ſerves well to ſhew that any particular viſible Church, even that of *Rome*, may faile; but from hence cannot be inferred, that a true Believer may fall away, and periſh. Neither is the aſſurance of ſalvation infringed by that *Phil.*2.12. *Worke out your own ſalvation with fear and trembling.* For as for our working out of our ſalvation, it hinders not but that we may be aſſured of our ſalvation. We may be aſſured of that, which yet wee muſt uſe meanes to obtaine. *Ezekiah* was aſſured that fifteene yeares ſhould be added unto his life, becauſe God by his Prophet had told him ſo, *Iſai.*38.5. Yet hee uſed meanes for his recovery, *v.*21. and ſo no queſtion but he did for the preſervation of his life, by eating and drinking, and the like. *Paul* alſo was aſſured, that both hee, and all in the Ship with him ſhould eſcape, becauſe God by his Angell had revealed it unto him, *Act.*27.23,24,25. yet nevertheleſſe he ſaw it needfull to uſe meanes, whereby they might eſcape, *Acts* 27.31. And for thoſe words, *with feare and trembling*, they doe not imply diffidence and doubting, but humility and lowlineſſe of minde; feare and trembling being here the ſame as *Romans* 11.20. *viz.* that which is oppoſit to pride and high-mindedneſſe. The Apoſtle 2 *Cor.*7.15. ſaith that the Corinthians *received* Titus *with fear and trembling*, that is, with all humility and reverence. So we muſt worke out our own ſalvation with fear and trembling, that is with reverence and with godly feare, as is expreſſed *Heb.*12.28. But this is no argument at all why wee may not be aſſured of our ſalvation; no more then it followes that therefore the Corinthians could not be aſſured of *Titus* his love and good will towards them, and that he came unto them for their good, becauſe they received him in that manner.

Hope maketh not aſhamed. Rom.5 5. *And every one that hath this hope, purifieth himſelfe, &c.* 1 Ioh. 3.3.

Ut in timore Deo ſerviant, id eſt, non altũ ſapiant, ſed timeant, quod ſignificat, non ſuperbiant, ſed humiles ſint. *Aug. de corrept. et grat* 6.9.

David Pſal.2.11. bids *ſerve the Lord with feare, and rejoyce with trembling.* Therefore there may bee feare and trembling, and yet rejoycing too, and conſequently aſſurance of Gods love and favour; for without aſſurance of it there can be no ſound rejoycing in it. *Joy* (as *Ramundus de Sabunde* obſerves) *doth ariſe from this, that one knowes that he hath that which he hath, and not meerly from this that he hath it.*

Gaudium oritur ex hoc, quòd aliqua res ſcit ſe habere id quod habet, non ex hoc, quòd habet. *Ramund. de Sabund. Theolog. natural. tit.* 95.

Now for the fathers here alleged by the Marqueſs, *viz. Am. Ser.*5. *in Pſal.*

Pſal. 118. Baſil. *in Conſtit. Monaſt. cap.* 2. *Hiero. li.* 2. *adverſ. Pelag. Chryſ. hom.* 87. *in Joh. Aug. in Pſal.* 40. *Bern. Ser.* 3. *de Advent. & Ser.* 1. *de Sept.* I anſwer, it's true, *Ambroſe* ſaith, *David deſired that his reproach, which he ſuſpected, might be taken away, either becauſe he had thought in his heart, but had not done it; and though it were aboliſhed by Repentance, yet he was fearfull leſt perhaps the reproch of it did yet remaine; and therefore he prayes God to take it away, who alone knows that which even he may be ignorant of that hath done it.* But this doth not argue that a man cannot in *Ambroſes* judgement be aſſured of his ſalvation; it onely ſhewes (contrary to what the Papiſts hold) that a man cannot be juſtified and ſaved by his owne inherent righteouſneſſe, becauſe though he be otherwiſe never ſo righteous, yet ſtill there is ſome ſinne in him, which hee knoweth not of; according to that of the Apoſtle (which *Ambroſe* there citeth) *I know nothing by my ſelfe, yet am I not thereby juſtified,* 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. The Apoſtle denieth that hee was juſtified by that righteouſneſſe that was in him, though hee had the teſtimony of a good conſcience to rejoyce in, 2 *Cor.* 1. 12. yet was hee nevertheleſſe aſſured that hee was juſtified, and ſhould be ſaved through faith in Chriſt Jeſus, as hath been proved before from *Rom.* 8. 33. &c. and from other places. This was all that * *Ambroſe* meant, as appeares by his words immediately going before thoſe objected; *The Apoſtle* (hee ſaith) *Explaines* Davids *meaning, ſaying, I know nothing by my ſelfe, yet am I not thereby juſtified. He knew that he was a man, and did take heed to himſelfe as he could, that he might not ſin after his Baptiſme; therefore he knew nothing by himſelfe; but becauſe he was a man, he confeſſed himſelfe a ſinner, knowing that Jeſus alone is the true light, who did no ſin, neither was guile found in his mouth, that he*

Volebat auferri opprobrium, quod ſuſpicatus eſt, vel quia cogitaverat in corde, & non fecerat, & pœnitentiâ licet abolitum, ſuſpectus tamen erat ne fortè adhuc maneret ejus opprobrium, & ideò Deum precatur ut illud auferat, qui ſolus novit quod neſcire poteſt etiam ipſe qui fecit. *Ambroſ Ser.* 5. *in Pſ.* 118. (*vel.* 119) 39.

* Subobſcurè dictum videtur, ſed explanavit Apoſtolus quod hic videbatur obſcurum, ubi ait, Nihil mihi conſcius ſum, ſed non in hoc juſtificatus ſum. Sciebat n. ſe eſſe hominem, & ſibi cavebat ut poterat, ne poſt ſuſcepta baptiſmi Sacramenta peccaret; ideoque delicti ſibi conſcius non erat: ſed quia homo erat, peccatorem ſe fatebatur, ſciens unum eſſe Jeſum lumen verum, qui peccatum non fecit, nec eſt inventus in ore ejus dolus, ipſum ſolum juſtificari, qui verè alienus eſſet à lapſu. *Ambr. Ibid.*

alone is juſtified (i.e. perfectly juſt in himſelfe) *who was truly without all ſin.*

That which *Baſil* (whoſe words I find in *Bellarmine*, though otherwiſe I have him not to peruſe) ſaith, is directly to the ſame purpoſe, and imports no more then that of *Ambroſe*. *We doe not underſtand* (ſaith he) *many things wherein we ſin. Therefore the Apoſtle ſaith, I know nothing by my ſelfe, yet am I not thereby juſtified, that is, I ſin in many things, and am not aware of it.* For *Hierome*, hee is too looſely cited both by the Marqueſſe, and before him by *Bellarmine*, there being eleven long Chapters in that booke which is mentioned, but in which of them he ſaith any thing againſt us, they doe not tell us. However the words objected are theſe. *There are righteous men, to whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked: and there are wicked men, to whom it happeneth according to the worke of the righteous. This is ſaid* (viz. Eccleſ. 8. 14.) *becauſe certaine judgement belongs only unto God.* Theſe words by ſearch I finde in *Hierome*; but it plainly appeares, that his ſcope onely is to prove againſt the Pelagians, that no man in this life is ſo righteous, as to be without ſinne, which is not againſt us in this controverſie, but for us in another, as hath beene ſhewed before. A little after thoſe words *Hierome* ſaith thus, *What mortall man is not taken with ſome errour?* And that *the righteous ſhall ſcarcely be ſaved* (1 Pet. 4. 18.) *becauſe in ſome things* (or rather indeed in all things) *he ſtands in neede of Gods mercy.* In the former Chapter *Hierome* brings in that of S. *Paul*; *I know nothing by my ſelfe, &c.* and ſaith, that though the Apoſtle were not conſcious to himſelfe of ſinne, yet hee did not juſtifie himſelfe, becauſe hee had read (*Pſal.* 19. 13.) *who can underſtand his*

Bell. de Iuſtif. li. 3. cap. 7.

Multa peccantes, plurima neque intelligimus. Quapropter dicit Apoſt. Nihil mihi conſcius ſum, ſed non in hoc juſtificatus ſum, h.e. multa pecco, & non intelligo. *Baſ. de Conſtit. Monaſt. cap. 2.*

Sunt juſti, ad quos pervenit quaſi opus impiorum, & ſunt impii, ad quos perverni quaſi opus juſtorum. Hoc idcircò dicitur, quia certum judicium ſolius Dei eſt. *Hier. adv. Pelag. l. 2. c. 2.*

Quis mortalium aliquo errore non capitur? —— Vix ſalvatur (juſtus) in eo, quòd in quibuſdam Dei indiget miſericordiâ. *Hieron. Ibid.*

Nihil mihi conſcius ſum, &c. Qui hoc dicebat, nullius utique peccati ſibi conſcius erat: ſed quia legerat, Delicta quis intelligit? &c. idcircò temperabat ſententiam, &c. *Hieron. adverſ. Pelag. l. 2. c. 1.*

his

his faults ? Thus then his teſtimony makes indeed againſt the perfection of a mans own righteouſneſſe ; but not againſt his aſſurance of ſalvation, which may well ſtand without the other.

Chryſoſtome in the place cited, comments upon that *Joh.* 21. 17. *Peter was grieved, becauſe he ſaid unto him the third time, loveſt thou me ?* and hee ſaith, that *Peter* feared leſt now hee thought himſelfe to love Chriſt, when hee did not ; as before he was deceived in thinking himſelfe ſtout and conſtant, when it proved otherwiſe.

Propterea contriſtatus ſum, ne fortè me amare arbitratus, non amem : ut anteà cum me fortem & conſtantem putarem, poſtmodum imbecillis deprehenſus ſum *Chryſ. Hom. 87. in Joh.*

But 1. Though *Chryſoſtome* ſo take the words of *Peter*, as if he might then be miſtaken in that opinion which hee had of himſelfe : yet it does not follow that therefore hee ſhould hold that a man cannot be aſſured that hee hath ſaving grace in him.

2. *Auſtine* gives another, and a better reaſon, why *Peter* was grieved that Chriſt did aske him that queſtion the third time, *viz.* becauſe thereby Chriſt (as he thought) ſeemed not to believe him ; not that hee ſuſpected his owne heart, but hee feared that Chriſt did ſuſpect him, becauſe he did aske him the ſame queſtion thrice over.

Cum jam tertiò ille tædio afficeretur, quaſi non ſibi crediderit. *Aug. in 1 Joh. Tract. 5.*

Maldonate the Jeſuite cites *Theodorus Heracleotes*, as alſo thus expounding it, and ſaying, that therefore *Peter* anſwered, *Lord, thou knoweſt all things, thou knoweſt that I love Thee* ; as if hee ſhould have ſaid, *Thou that knoweſt all things, canſt not but know that it is true that I ſay : and therefore why doeſt thou aske mee ſo often, as if thou didſt not believe me ?* This Expoſition *Maldonate* doth prefer before the other of *Chryſoſtome*, which he alſo mentioneth, and ſaith, that *Peter* ſaying, *Lord, thou knoweſt*, did ſpeak ſo, not ſo much out of modeſty, as to confirme that which hee had ſaid, (*viz.* that he loved Chriſt) by Chriſts own teſtimony.

Magis probo quod ſcribit Theodorus Heracleotes, contriſtatum fuiſſe, quòd cum Chriſtus eum tam ſepè, & tam diligenter interrogaverat, indicare videretur ſe illum ſuſpectum habere &c. propterea reſpondiſſe, Domine tu noſti, &c. q.d. Tu, qui omnia noſti, ignorare non potes verum eſſe, quod dico : quid ergò, quaſi mihi non credens, me tam ſæpè rogas? *Maldon. in Joh. 21. 16, 17, 18.*

Quod ſubjungit, Domine tu ſcis, non ſolum moderationis cauſâ dictum puto, ſed multo etiam magis, ut quod dixerat, etiam, ipſus Chriſti teſtimonio confirmaret. *Maldon. Ibid.*

Auſtine

Auſtine in *Pſal.*40. hath nothing (that I can ſee) to the purpoſe; I ſuppoſe it ſhould be in *Pſalme* 41. from whence *Bellarmine* doth produce this, *I know that the righteouſneſſe of God doth remaine, whether my righteouſneſſe may remaine, I know not. For the Apoſtle doth make me to feare, ſaying, Let him that thinketh he ſtandeth, take heede leſt he fall.* (1 Cor.10.12.) I acknowledge theſe words of *Auſtine*; but that which followes immediately, ſhewes the meaning of them. *Therefore* (ſaith hee) *becauſe I have no ſtrength* (*or ſtability*) *in my ſelfe, neither have I hope of my ſelfe, my ſoule is troubled toward my ſelfe. Wouldeſt thou not have it troubled? Doe not abide in thy ſelfe, but, ſay, unto thee, O Lord, have I lift up my ſoule* (Pſal.25.1.) *Heare this more plainly, Doe not hope of thy ſelfe, but of thy God. For if thou doeſt hope of thy ſelfe, thy ſoule will be troubled towards thee, becauſe it hath not yet found whereby it may be ſecure of thee. Therefore becauſe my ſoule is troubled towards me, what remaines but humility, that the ſoule doe not preſume of it ſelfe?* Thus it clearly appeares, that *Auſtine* ſpake not againſt aſſurance of ſalvation, but onely againſt ſelfe-confidence, and preſumption.

Novi quia juſtitia Dei maner, ultrùm mea maneat neſcio. Terret enim me Apoſt. dicens, Qui ſe putat ſtare, videat ne cadat. *Aug. in Pſal.*41.8.

Ergo quia non eſt in me firmitas mihi, nec eſt mihi ſpes de me, ad me ipſum turbata eſt anima mea. Vis non conturbetur? Non remaneas in teipſo, & dic, Ad te Domine levavi animam meam. Hoc planiùs audi, Noli ſperare de te, ſed de Deo tuo. Nam ſi ſperas de te, anima tua conturbabitur ad te, quia nondum invenit unde ſit ſecura de te. Ergo quoniam ad me conturbata eſt anima mea, quid reſtat niſi humilitas, ut de ſe ipsâ anima non præſumat? *Aug. Ibid.*

The laſt Father alledged is *Bernard*, who ſaith, *This doth adde to the heape of care, and to the weight of feare, that When as it's neceſſary to looke both to mine owne, and my Neighbours conſcience, neither of them is ſufficiently knowne unto me. Both are an unſearchable depth, both are night unto me.*

Accedit ad ſollicitudinis cumulum, & pondus timoris, quòd cum & meam, & proximi conſcientiam ſervare neceſſe ſit, neutra mihi ſatis eſt nota. Utraque abyſſus eſt imperſcrutabilis, utraque mihi nox eſt, &c. *Bern. Ser.*3. *de Advent.*

But *Bernard* onely meanes that it's very hard for a man to know his owne heart, becauſe of the deceitfulneſſe of it, not but that by the Spirit of God a man may know it ſo farre forth as to be aſſured of the truth of Grace in him; which hath beene proved before by *Bernards* teſtimony in diverſe places. So elſewhere hee ſaith indeed, *Who can ſay, I am of the Elect,*

Quis poteſt dicere, Ego de electis ſum, ego de prædeſtinatis ad vitam, ego de numero filiorum? Quis hæc, inquam, dicere poteſt? reclamante nimirum Scripturâ, Neſcit homo ſi ſit dignus amore, an odio. Certitudinem utique non habemus, ſed ſpei fiducia conſolatur nos, ne dubitationis anxietate penitus cruciemur. *Bern. Ser. 1. in. Septuag.*

I am of thoſe that are predeſtinate unto life, I am of the number of Gods children? Who, I ſay, can ſay theſe things? the Scripture ſaying on the contrary, Man knowes not whether he be worthy of love, or hatred. Surely we have no certainty, but the confidence of hope doth comfort us, leſt we ſhould be tormented with the anxiety of doubting.

But 1. *Bernard* here builds upon a falſe ground, *viz.* that the Scripture ſaith, *No man knowes whether he be worthy of love or hatred, i. e.* whether hee be in ſuch an eſtate, as to be loved of God, or hated of him: whereas *Salomon* Eccleſ. 9. 1. (which place he meaneth) onely ſaith, *No man knoweth love or hatred by all that is before them*; that is, by outward things which befall men, as proſperity and adverſity, they cannot conclude either that God doth love, or that hee doth hate them: becauſe (as it followes immediately) *All things come alike to all, i. e.* all outward things; proſperity happens to the wicked, and adverſity to the godly; and therefore there is no judging of Gods love, or hatred by theſe things: yet it followes not but that by other markes and trials a man may know whether God love him or no; and ſo much *Bernard* himſelfe hath confeſſed, as I have ſhewed.

2. Neither doth *Bernard* here abſolutely deny that any can know himſelfe to of the number of thoſe that ſhall be ſaved, onely he denies ſuch a knowledge, ſo ſure and certaine, as to exclude all care of obtaining ſalvation. For ſo hee addes immediately, *Therefore there are given certaine ſignes, and manifeſt tokens of ſalvation, that it may be without doubt that he is of the number of the Elect, in whom thoſe ſignes ſhall remaine. Therefore, I ſay, whom God foreknew, them alſo he predeſtinated to be be conformed to the image of his Son, that to whom he denies certainty, that they may be carefull, he yet affords confidence, that they may have comfort.* I grant, that *Bernard* preſently after ſeemes

Propter hoc data ſunt ſigna quædam & indicia manifeſta ſalutis, ut indubitabile ſit eum eſſe de numero electorum, in quo ea ſigna permanſerint. Propter hoc, inquam, quos præſcivit Deus, & prædeſtinavit conformes fieri imagini filii ſui, ut quibus certitudinem negat cauſâ ſollicitudinis, vel fiduciam præſtet gratiâ conſolationis, *Bern. Ibid.*

to

to be very peremptory against a mans being assured of his perseverance, saying, *What we are we may know, at lest in part: What we shall be, that is altogether impossible for us to know.* But it hath beene proved before both by Scriptures and Fathers, that true justifying faith once had cannot bee wholy lost. And even *Bernard* himselfe (as before is shewed) doth hold that a man may know assuredly that he is justified, and that therefore hee shall be glorified, because the Apostle saith that *whom God hath justified, them also he hath glorified*, that is, will certainly glorifie, *Rom.* 8.30.

Quales sumus, nosse possumus, vel ex parte; quales autem futuri sumus, id nosse penitus nobis impossibile est. *Bern. Ibid.*

And therefore here hee must be understood as intending only to prevent security, and a casting off all care for the future. For so immediately hee goes on, *Therefore let him that standeth take heed lest he fall: and let him continue and goe on in that, which is both a token of salvation, and an argument of Predestination.* Thus then notwithstanding any thing contained either in the Scriptures, or the Fathers, which are alledged, the Doctrine of Protestants concerning assurance of salvation doth remaine firme and sure, *viz.* that a man may have this assurance. And if so, then surely (which is the other position) all ought to labour for this assurance, it being to be had, and well worth the labouring for that it may be had; the Scripture also requiring us *to give diligence to make our calling and our election sure*, 2 Pet. 1.10.

Itaque qui stat, videat ne cadat, & in formâ, quæ salutis indicium est, & argumentum prædestinationis, perseveret atque proficiat. *Bern. Ibid.*

To proceede, *We say* (saith the Marquesse) *that every man hath an Angel guardian; you say he hath not. We have Scripture for it, viz.* Mat. 18.10. *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in Heaven there Angels do alwayes behold the face of my Father.* Acts 12.13. S. Peter *knocking at the door, they say, It is his Angel. They believed this in the Apostles time. The Fathers believes it, &c.* Page 67.

Answ. For every ones having a peculiar Angel to guard him, I know not any great controversie that there is betwixt Protestants and them of the Church of Rome about it. *Bellarmine* in all his three great volumes of controversies hath none of this that I doe finde. Whether severall Believers have severall

Angels for their guardians *Calvin* neither affirmes, nor denies, *Inſtit. lib.* 1. *cap.* 14. *Sect.* 7. The Rhemiſts on *Mat.*18.10. ſay that he will needs doubt of it, but that he dares not deny it. The Scripture is cleare for this, that the Angels are appointed to guard the Elect; *They are all miniſtering ſpirits, ſent forth to Miniſter for thoſe that ſhall be heires of ſalvation*, Heb.1.14. The like is to be ſeene in other places, as *Pſal.*34. 7. and 91.11. But that every one hath his peculiar Angell, this is not ſo cleare but that we may well doubt of it. Yea, if it be ſo underſtood, that each believer hath onely one Angell guarding him, it will not agree with that *Pſal.* 91. 11. *He hath given his Angels charge over thee, to keep thee, &c.* Nor with that *Gen.* 32.1,2. Where it is ſaid that as *Jacob* was returning out of *Meſopotamia* into *Canaan, the Angells of God met him*; and therefore hee called the name of the place *Mahanaim*, that is, two Campes, or two Hoſts, *viz.* that of his owne, and the other of the Angels. In this therefore *Calvin* might well be confident, as hee was, that *every one of us hath not only one Angell to care for us, but that they all with one conſent to watch for our ſafety. This*, hee ſaith, *is to be held for certaine.* Neither durſt the Rhemiſts, or any others (that I know) quarrell with him about it. For thoſe two places, which the Marqueſſe alledgeth, they are neither of them ſufficient to prove that every believer hath his peculiar Angell. That *Mat.* 18. 10. where our Saviour ſpeaking of believers, calles the Angells *their Angels*, doth evince no more then this, that believers have the Angels to attend upon them. For there is no neceſſity to underſtand it ſo that each particular Believer hath his particular Angell; no more then becauſe it's ſaid, *obey your guides* (τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν) or *governours*, Heb.13.17. therefore each one hath his peculiar guide or governour: or becauſe its ſaid *Iſai.*3. 4. *I will give children to be there Princes*, therefore each ſeverall perſon had his ſeverall Prince, or Magiſtrate. The other place, *viz.* Acts 12.15. *it is his Angell*, viz. *Peters*, is more obſcure, neither (I confeſſe) doe I well know how to underſtand it. Some by *Angell* there underſtand not a cæleſtiall ſpirit, but a meſſenger,

Hoc quidem pro certo habendum, non tantum uni Angelo unumquemque noſtrum eſſe curæ, ſed omnes uno conſenſu vigilare pro ſalute noſtrâ. *Calv. Inſtit. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. *Sect.* 7. *Similia habet ad Mat.*18.10.

as the Greeke word ἄγγελος, whence the Latine *Angelus*, and the Engliſh *Angell* is derived, doth primarily import. And they conceive this to be the meaning, that the Damoſell did not tell thoſe within, that ſhe heard *Peters* voyce, but onely ſaid, that *Peter* was at the doore, and ſhe conſtantly affirming this, they ſuppoſed that *Peter* had ſent ſome meſſenger, and that the Damoſell miſtaking what he ſaid, imagined that *Peter* himſelfe was there. But it is not probable but that the Damoſell would ſignifie that it was *Peters* voyce, which ſhe heard, the Scripture expreſſely ſaying, *v.* 14. that *ſhe knew Peters voyce*. On the other-ſide, if a Heavenly Angell be there meant, it ſeemes to imply, that they ſuppoſed the Angell that garded *Peter*, and therefore is called *his Angel*, to repreſent the perſon of *Peter*, and to aſſume his voyce; which conceit ſeemes very uncouth. However, if ſuch an Angell be there meant, yet onely this can be inferred from thence, that *Peter* had his Angell to guard him; but it followes not, that therefore he had an Angell proper and peculiar to himſelfe, and that only one certaine Angell was appointed his guardian. *Camer. Myroth. ad Act.* 12. 15.

Neither doe the Fathers, that are cited, (ſo far as I can ſee) ſpeake home to the point in queſtion. *Gregory* of whom mention is firſt made, is here ſo impertinently alledged, that I ſuppoſe there was ſome overſight in it. For hee ſpeakes nothing at all of the Angels guarding men, but onely of their being preſent at the celebration of the Euchariſt; which is nothing to our preſent purpoſe.

Quis enim fidelium habere dubium poſſit, in ipſâ immolationis horâ, ad ſacerdotis vocem cælos aperiri, in illo Jeſu Chriſti myſterio Angelorum choros adeſſe, &c. *Greg. dial. lib.* 4. *cap.* 58.

Athanaſius, who is mentioned next, ſaith onely that there are ſome ſupercæleſtiall powers, *qui apud homines permanent*, that doe abide with men, and are *hominum pædagogi*, mens inſtructors or governours: but of particular Angels belonging to particular men hee ſpeakes nothing. *Chryſoſtome* in one place, which the Marqueſſe quoteth, ſpeakes of the Angels being preſent, when the Euchariſt is celebrated, and of their conveying to Heaven the ſoules of ſuch, as immediately before their death with a pure conſcience received that Sacrament; which hee ſaith one told him, that ſaw it; but to the queſtion now agitat-

Athanaſ. de communi eſſentia, ſub finem.

Chryſoſt. de Sacerd. lib. 6.

ed, I finde not that hee ſaith any thing in that place. Indeed *Hom.*3. (not as it is miſquoted, *Hom.*2.) in *Coloſſ.* hee citeth, *Mat.*18.10. and ſaith, *Every Believer hath an Angell:* but this doth not neceſſarily import, that each Believer hath his peculiar Angell. What *Gregorious Turonenſis* ſaith, (whoſe teſtimony is the next) wanting his works, I cannot yet examine. The next after him is *Auſtine*, but he is miſ-alledged, *viz. Epiſt. ad Probam cap.*19. Whereas there are but 16. Chapters in that Epiſtle, which is wholly about prayer, and hath nothing (that I finde) about Angels. The laſt witneſſe is *Hierome*, who ſaith indeed, *Great is the dignity of ſoules, that every one from his birth hath an Angell appointed to keepe him.* But it doth not appeare, that he thought every one to have his peculiar Angell. The contrary rather appeares by that which hee addes immediatly after, *viz.* that hereupon *John* Revel.2. & 3. was bidden to write to the Angell of *Epheſus*, *Thyatira*, *Philadelphia*, and the other foure Churches there mentioned. Though *Hierome* doe miſ-interpret the Angels there ſpoken of in the *Revelation*, and therefore both hee, and ſome others of the ancients are in this rejected by *Ribera*, yet thereby we may perceive, that he did not hold every one to have a peculiar Angell, but one Angell to be for a whole Church. If it be ſaid, that there by Angell he meant Angells, the ſingular number being put for the plurall, the ſame may be ſaid concerning the other words which are objected. But enough of this point; there is more controverſie about thoſe that follow.

Unuſquiſque n. fidelis habet angelum. *Chryſ. hom.*3. *in Coloſſ. Similiter, ad Mat.* 18. 10. His innuit verbis noſtrum unumquemlibet angelum habere.

Magna dignitas animarum, ut unaquæque habeat ab ortu nativitatis in cuſtodiam ſui Angelum delegatum. *Hieron. in Mat.* 18. 10.

Unde legimus in Apocalypſi Joannis, Angelo Epheſi, Thyatiræ, et Angelo Philadelphiæ, & angelis quatuor reliquarum Eccleſiarum ſcribe hæc. *Hieron. Ibid.*

Riber. in Apoc. 1. *ult.*

Page 67. *We ſay* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *the Angells pray for us, knowing our thoughts, and deeds: you deny it. We have Scipture for it,* Zach.1.9,10,11,12. *Then the Angell of the Lord anſwered, and ſaid, O Lord of hoſtes, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jeruſalem, and on the Cities of Judah, againſt whom thou haſt had indignation theſe threeſcore and ten yeares?* Apoc.8.4. *And the ſmoak of the incenſe of the prayers of the Saints aſcended from the hand of the Angell before the Lord. This place was ſo underſtood by*

Irenaus

Irenæus lib.4.cap.34. *and S.* Hilary *in* Pſal.129. *tells us, This interceſſion of Angels Gods Nature needeth not, but our infirmities doe. So S.* Ambroſe *lib.de viduis, Victor Utic. lib.* 3. *de perſecut. Vandal.*

Anſw. Had the Marqueſſe onely ſaid, that the Angels know our deedes, and pray for us, there had beene little cauſe to oppoſe: but whereas hee ſaith that they know our thoughts, that may not bee granted, the Scripture making this Gods Prerogative. *For thou, even thou onely knoweſt the hearts of all the children of men.* 1 Kings 8. 39. † *Theophylact* therefore upon *Luke* 5. 22. ſaith that CHRIST proved himſelfe to be God by this, that (as it is there ſaid) hee knew mens thoughts. And the ſame alſo is obſerved by * *Janſenius* in his Comment upon the place. For that in *Zach.*1.12.

† ἐαυτοῖς διελογίζοντο, ταῦτα αὐτὸς σωίησιν. ὅθεν πάνυ δῆλον ὅτι θεός ἐστι. θεῷ γὰρ τὸ εἰδέναι καρδίας. *Theophyl. in Luc.* 5.

* Oſtendit ſibi competere, quod etiam Scripturæ Deo proprium eſſe paſſim docent, dum declarat ſe cordium eſſe inſpectorem, &c. *Janſen.Concord.cap.* 32.

ſome by the Angell there ſpoken of underſtand Chriſt, *the Angel (or Meſſenger) of the Covenant,* as he is called *Mal.*3.1. But others underſtand a created Angell, *viz.* the Angell that talked with the Prophet *Zachary*, and thence obſerve that the Angels pray for the Church. This ſeemes more probable by the words immediately following, *And the Lord anſwered the Angell that talked with me,* v.13. In the other place, *viz.*Revel. 8.4. *Ribera* telleth us, that many thinke the Angell there mentioned to be Chriſt. And though he diſlike that Expoſition, yet it is more then probable by that which is ſaid *v.*3. *There was given him much incenſe, that he ſhould offer it with the prayers of all Saints, &c.* For what can we well underſtand by that incenſe, but Chriſts Merit and Meditation, whereby the prayers of the Saints are acceptable and well pleaſing unto God?

Vulg. Angelus teſtamenti.

Hunc multi Chriſtum eſſe exiſtimant. *Rib. ad Apoc.*8.3. *The ſame alſo is confeſſed by the Rhemiſts upon the place.*

For the Fathers alledged, * *Irenæus* ſpeaketh not either of this Angell ſpoken of *Revel.*8.4. or at all of Angells praying

* Eſt ergo altare in cælis. Illuc enim preces noſtræ diriguntur, & ad templum, quemadmodum Joan. in Apocal. ait, Et apertum eſt templum Dei, & tabernaculum. Ecce enim, inquit, tabernaculum Dei, in quo habitabit hominibus. *Iren. lib.*4. *cap.*34.

for

for us. All that he ſaith is, that there is an altar in Heaven, to which our prayers muſt be directed: and then hee cites *John* ſaying in the *Revelation*, that the Temple and Tabernacle of God was opened: but this is nothing to the point in hand.

Interceſſione itaque horum non natura Dei eget, ſed infirmitas noſtra. *Hilar. in Pſal.* 129.

Hilary is truly cited, ſpeaking of the interceſſion of Angels, he ſaith, that not Gods Nature, but our infirmity doth ſtand in need of it.

Whether thoſe bleſſed ſpirits pray for us, is not here the queſtion, but whether we are to pray unto them. B. Vſher. Anſw. p. 421. *He ſpeaks of the Saints, but it may hold of the Angels.* Hieron. præfat. in Proverb.

But (as I ſaid before) I ſee not why wee ſhould deny, that the Angels pray for us; for it doth not therefore follow, that wee may pray to them; which is the next point to be conſidered. Yet I ſhould have liked it better, if *Hilary* had grounded himſelfe upon that place of *Zachary*, which the Marqueſſe produced, then that hee ſhould build upon the Booke of *Tobit* (as alſo doth *Ambroſe Ser.* 92. for I finde nothing this way in the place, which the Marqueſſe quoteth) that Booke (as *Hierome* long agoe hath cenſured it) being Apocryphall, and of no authority for the determining of matters of this nature. What the laſt Author ſaith, *viz. Victor Vticenſis*, being not furniſhed with his Booke, I cannot tell; neither is there neede to inquire after him, hee being alledged for no more then *Hilarie*, and hee aſſerting no more then (I thinke) may be granted.

Page 68.

But from the angels praying for us the Marqueſs paſſeth to our praying to the angells. *We hold it lawfull* (ſaith hee) *to pray unto them: you not. We have Scripture for it*, Gen. 48. 16. *The Angell which redeemed me from all evill, bleſſe theſe Lads, &c.* Hoſ. 12. 4. *He had power over the Angell, and prevailed: he Wept and made ſupplications unto them.* *S.* Auſtine *expounding theſe words of* Job 19. 21. *Have pity upon me, O yee my friends, for the hand of the Lord is upon me, ſaith, that holy* Job *addreſſed himſelf to the Angels.*

Prayer is a worſhip, a Religious worſhip as our adverſaries grãt. Now worſhipping of Angels is condemned, Col. 2. 18. & Revel. 19. 10. & 22. 9.

Anſw. That it is lawfull to pray unto angels, Proteſtants deny, and that juſtly, there being no ground, nor warrant for it in the Scripture, but much againſt it. For the Scripture every where teacheth and requireth us to pray unto God, and to none other. *Call upon me in the day of trouble.* Pſal. 50. 15. *After this manner therefore pray yee, Our Father, &c.* Mat. 6. 9. *When*

yee

yee pray ſay our Father, &c. Luke 11.2. *In the day of my trouble I will call upon thee.* Pſal. 85.7. *As for me I will call upon God.* Pſal. 55.16. *For this ſhall every one that is godly pray unto thee.* Pſal. 32.6. *How ſhall they call upon him, in whom they have not believed?* Rom.10.14. Now wee both profeſſe in the Creed, and ſo are taught in the Scripture, to believe onely in God. *That your faith and hope might be in God.* 1 Pet.1.21. *Ye believe in God, believe alſo in me.* Joh.14.1. *viz.* becauſe Chriſt, who there ſpeakes, is God. Prayer muſt proceede from the heart, and not from the lips onely. *Give eare unto my prayer, that goeth not out of fained lips.* Pſal.17.1. *Vnto thee O Lord doe I lift up my ſoule.* Pſal.25.1. *Poure forth your hearts unto him.* Pſal.62.8. *Hannah ſpake in her heart, &c.* 1 Sam.1.13. Now God only knoweth the heart, as was ſhewed before.

The Fathers were of this minde. [a] *Tertullian* writing of prayer, and expounding the Lords Prayer, upon the firſt words of it ſaith, *We pray unto God.* And afterwards in the ſame book, [b] *We commend our prayers unto God*: neither does hee ſpeake of praying unto any other. And elſewhere, [c] *We call upon the Eternall God* (ſaith he) *for the ſafety of the Emperours.* [d] And againe more fully to the purpoſe, *Theſe things I cannot pray for from any other, but from him, from whom I know I ſhall obtaine; becauſe he it is, who alone doth give them.*

a Nam & Deum oramus, &c. *Tertull. de orat. cap. 2.*

b Commendamus Deo preces noſtras. *Ibid cap.13.*

c Nos pro ſalute imperatorum, Deum invocamus æternum, &c. *Tertull. Apolog. cap.* 30.

d Hæc ab alio orare non poſſum, quàm à quo me ſcio conſecuturum, quoniam & ipſe eſt, qui ſolus præſtat, &c. *Tertull. Ibid.*

So *Cyprian* alſo writing of the Lords Prayer, all along ſuppoſeth, and taketh it for granted, that it is God to whom wee muſt pray. Hee ſaith that *to pray otherwiſe then Chriſt hath taught us, is not only ignorance, but a ſin alſo.* Now Chriſt hath taught us to pray unto God onely.

Ut aliter orare quàm docuit, non ignorantia ſola ſit, ſed & culpa. *Cypr. de orat. Dom.*

And *Cyprian* ſaith, that *Wee muſt pray with the heart rather then with the voyce, becauſe God heares not ſo much the voyce as the heart.* Hee ſaith that *before prayer* (viz. in the Congregation) *the people were required*

Quia Deus non vocis, ſed cordis auditor eſt. Nec admonendus eſt clamoribus, qui cogitationes hominum videt. *Cypr. Ibid.*

Ideo & ſacerdos ante orationem præfatione præmiſſâ, parat fratrum mentes dicendo Surſum corda; ut dum reſpondet plebs, Habemus ad Dominum, admoneatur nihil aliud ſe, quàm Dominum cogitare debere. *Cypr. Ibid.* Quomodo te audiri à Deo poſtulas, cum te ipſe non audias? *Ibid.*

to lift up their hearts; and they uſed to anſwer, wee lift them up unto the Lord; whereby they were admoniſhed to thinke of nothing but the Lord when they prayed. And taxing thoſe that pray negligently, *How doeſt thou requeſt that God ſhould heare thee, when as thou doeſt not hear thy ſelf?*

And ſome of the ancients have proved Chriſt to be God by this very argument that hee is called upon, and prayed unto. *If Chriſt be onely man (* ſaith * *Novatian) Why is man called upon in prayers as Mediatour, ſeeing that the invocation of a man is judged ineffectuall to afford ſalvation?* Though *Novatian* in ſome things proved an Heretike, yet was hee not an Heretike in this: yea † *Pamelius* a Romaniſt tells us, that he wrote this whiles, for any thing that appeares, he was a Catholik.

* Si homo tantùmodò Chriſtus, cur homo in orationibus mediator invocatur, cum invocatio hominis ad præſtandam ſalutem inefficax judicetur? *Novat. de Trinit. cap.* 14. † De Trinitate diſputaturus Novatianus Presbyter Romanus ſub S. Fabiano Papa, quantum apparet, adhuc Catholicus, &c. *Pamel. in argum. lib. de Trinit.*

Thus alſo that great hammer of the Arians, *Athanaſius*, proved Chriſt to be conſubſtantiall to the Father, by that of the Apoſtle, 1 *Theſſ.*3.11. *Now God himſelfe, and our Father, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt direct our way unto you.*

Neque enim quiſpiam precaretur accipere à Deo, & ab Angelis, aut ab ullis rebus creatis. Neque quiſquam hanc verborum formam concepit, Det tibi Deus, & Angelus; ſed contra à Patre, & Filio propter unitatem uniformemque rationem dandi. *Athanaſ. orat.* 4. *contra Arianos.*

For (ſaith hee *) none would pray to receive from God and from the Angels, or from any of the creatures. Neither would any ſpeake in this manner, God and an Angell give unto thee. But the Apoſtle askes of the Father and of the Son, becauſe of the unity of their nature, and the uniforme manner of their giving.*

Non aliquem Angelorum cratorum, & qui naturâ Angeli erant in unum copulavit cum Creatore Deo, neque omiſſo nutritio ſuo Deo, ab Angelo benedictionem ſuis nepotibus poſtulavit: ſed quia diſertè locutus eſt de Angelo, qui illum ab omnibus malis liberaverat, ſatis præ ſe tulit non ex

And immediately after hee anſwers that place which the Marqueſſe alledgeth, *viz.* Gen.48.16. *The Angel that reedemed me from all evill, bleſſe the Lads*, ſaying, *Jacob did not comple any of the created and naturall Angels with God the Creatour; neither did he omit God that nouriſhed him, and deſire*

a

*a bleſſing for his nephewes from an Angell. But in that he ſpake expreſſely of the Angell that redeemed him from all evill, he ſhewed ſufficiently, that it was none of the created Angells, but the Son of the Father, whom he in his prayers joyned with the Father, by whom God doth redeem whom he pleaſeth. For he knew him to be the * Angell of the Fathers great Counſell, neither did he in his words expreſſe any other but him that doth bleſſe, and redeeme from evill.*

creatis Angelis aliquem, ſed Filium fuiſſe Patris, quem Patri in ſuis precibus conſociavit, per quem Deus liberat quos vult. Hunc enim magni conſilii Patris Angelum noverat, nec alium niſi illum ipſum, qui benedicit, & liberat ex malis, ſuis verbis expreſſit. *Athanaſ. Ibid.*

* *So Chriſt is ſtiled* Iſai. 9.6. *according to the Greeke Tranſlation.*

Auſtine alſo in his booke *of true Religion*, doth frequently aſſert that religious worſhip belongs not unto Angells, but to God onely; and conſequently that Angels are not to be prayed unto, Prayer and Invocation being (as *Bellarmine* confeſſeth) a ſingular kinde of adoration. *That* (ſaith * *Auſtine*) *which the higheſt Angell doth worſhip, is alſo to be worſhipped by the loweſt man.——Let us believe that the beſt Angels and the moſt excellent Miniſters of God deſire this, that we together with themſelves may worſhip only God, by whoſe contemplation they are bleſſed.——Therefore we honour them with love, not with ſervice.—Rightly therefore is it written, that a man was forbidden by an Angell to worſhip him, and was required only to worſhip God, under whom the Angell was mans fellow-ſervant.——Behold I worſhip only God, &c. Which of the Angells ſoever doth love this God, I am ſure doth alſo love me.——Therefore let Religion binde us only to the Almighty God.*

Quarta de Invocatione, quæ eſt eximium genus adorationis. *Bellar. ord. diſput. de Eccleſ. Triumph.*

* Quod colit ſummus Angelus, id colendum etiam ab homine ultimo.——Hoc etiam ipſos optimos Angelos, & excellentiſſima Dei Miniſteria velle credamus, ut unum cum ipſis colamus Deum, cujus contemplatione beati ſunt.——Quarè honoramus eos charitate, non ſervitute.——Rectè itaque ſcribitur hominem ab Angelo prohibitum, ne ſe adoraret, ſed unum Deum, ſub quo ei eſſet & ille conſervus.——Ecce unum Deum colo, &c. Quiſquis Angelorum diligit hunc Deum, certus ſum quòd etiam me diligit.——Religet ergò nos Religio uni omnipotenti Deo. *Aug. de verâ relig. cap. ult.*

Now for the two places of Scripture, which the Marqueſſe objecteth, one of them is already anſwered from *Athanaſius*. And the ſame anſwer alſo belongs to the other place, *viz.* Hoſ. 12.4. the Angell there ſpoken of is not a created Angell,

but God himſelfe, as appeares by the words immediately going before v. 3. *He had power with God*; then followes v.4. *yea he had power over the Angell, and prevailed; he wept alſo, and made ſupplications unto him.* This ſhewes that God and the Angell there mentioned are one and the ſame. This which the Prophet ſpeaketh of *Jacobs* making ſupplications to the Angell, hath reference to that Gen. 32.26. *I will not let thee go except thou bleſſe me*, as *Hierome* upon the place obſerveth. Now if *Jacob* would not deſire a bleſſing for his Nephewes from a created Angell (and wee have ſeene that in the judgement of *Athanaſius* hee would not) then ſurely neither was it ſuch an Angell of whom he himſelfe did ſeeke to be bleſſed. And *Hierome* upon the words of *Hoſea* ſaith plainly that this angell is God. None of the Fathers are here alledged againſt us, but onely *Auſtine*, whom I have ſhewed to teſtifie abundantly for us. That which hee ſaith in the place quoted, is that *Job* ſeemeth to deſire the angels to intreat for him, or elſe ſome of the Saints. But *Pineda* a Jeſuite doth not like this Expoſition, but calles it allegoricall, and expoundes it (as it ought to be expounded) of thoſe friends of *Job* that diſputed with him. If our adverſaries ſhall reply, that though *Auſtine* did not rightly expound the words of *Job*, yet however hee ſhewed it to be his opinion, that the angells might be prayed unto. I anſwer, firſt *Auſtine* here maketh as well againſt them, as againſt us. For he ſpeakes as much of *Jobs* praying unto Saints, as unto angells: now our adverſaries hold (as I ſhall ſhew more hereafter) that in thoſe times before Chriſts comming the Saints were not to be prayed unto. Again, *Auſtine* doth not ſay, that *Job* did pray either to Saints or angels, but that hee deſired, yea onely that hee ſeemeth to have deſired, that they might pray for him. Thirdly for one place, wherein *Auſtine* ſpeaketh obſcurely and doubtfully for praying to angels, wee have many plaine and evident teſtimonies of his againſt it, as before I have ſhewed.

Roboratus benedictionibus Angeli, qui ipſe eſt Deus. *Hieron. in Hoſ.* 12.

Angelos videtur poſtulare, ut pro eo deprecentur, aut certè ſanctos, ut pro pœnitente orent. *Aug. in Job.* 19.21.

Quod Auguſtinus exponit hîc Angelos, aut ſanctos invocari, allegoricum eſt. *Pined in Job* 19. 21.

Amicos nominat, quibuſcum diſputat. *Pined. Ibid.*

Laſtly,

Laſtly, *Auſtine* himſelfe hath taught us to believe neither him, nor any other further then they accord with the Scriptures, but that we may, ſaving the reverence that is due unto them, diſſent from them, when as they diſſent from the truth. Thus he ſaith, he did in reſpect of the writings of others, and ſo he would have others to doe in reſpect of his writings.

Neque enim quorumlibet diſputationes, quamvis Catholicorum & laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas Canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat ſalvâ honorificentiâ, quæ illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum ſcriptis improbare, atque reſpuere, ſi forte invenerimus quòd aliter ſenſerint quam veritas habet, divino adjutorio vel ab aliis intellecta, vel à nobis. Talis ego ſum in ſcriptis aliorum; tales volo eſſe intellectores meorum. *Aug. Epiſt.* 111.

From the Angels the Marqueſs paſseth to the Saints deceaſed, ſaying, *We hold that the Saints deceaſed know what paſſeth here on Earth; you ſay they know not: We have Scripture for it.* Luke 16.29. *Where* Abraham *knew that there were* Moſes *and the Prophets bookes here on Earth, which he himſelfe had never ſeene when he was alive. The Fathers ſay as much, Euſeb. Ser. de Ann. S. Hiero. in Epit. Paulæ, S. Max. Ser. de Agnete.* *Page 68.*

Anſw. That the Saints deceaſed doe not know the particular affaires of men here on Earth, the Scripture doth teach us, *Job.* 14.21. *His ſonnes come to honour, and he knoweth it not, and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.* There *Job* ſpeakes indefinitely of a man departed out of this life (whether he be Saint, or no Saint) and ſheweth, that he doth not ſo much as underſtand the eſtate of ſuch as had moſt neare relation unto him: and how then ſhall we perſwade our ſelves, that hee doth underſtand the eſtate of others? And from thoſe words *Iſai.* 63.16. *Abraham is ignorant of us, and Iſrael knoweth us not,* *Auſtine* doth inferre that the Dead are not acquainted with the affaires of the Living. *If not our parents,* (ſaith hee) *what other dead perſons know what we doe, or ſuffer? If ſo great Patriarkes* (Abraham *and* Jacob) *knew not how it fared with thoſe that did deſcend from them, how doe the dead intermeddle in knowing and helping the affaires of thoſe that are alive?* For my part, I thinke that place of *Eſay* not ſo pertinent to the purpoſe

Si parentes non interſunt, qui ſunt alii mortuorum, qui noverunt quid agamus, quidve patiamur? Si tanti Patriarchæ quid erga populum ex ipſis procreatum ageretur, ignoraverunt, quomodo mortui vivorum rebus, atque actibus cognoſcendis adjuvandiſque miſcentur? *Aug. de curâ pro mortuis, cap.* 13.

poſe, but that the meaning of it is, that the people of Iſrael were ſo degenerate, that *Abraham* and *Iſrael* (if they knew what manner of perſons they were) would not own them, not acknowledge them for their poſterity: yet however, *Auſtine* ſheweth what his Opinion was concerning thoſe that are deceaſed, *viz.* that they are ignorant of the things that are done here; which is evident enough by thoſe words of *Job* before cited.

Bell. de Sanct. beat. lib. 1. c. 20.

Bellarmine ſayes that *Gregory* upon the place doth anſwer, that naturally the dead know not how it fares with the liking; but that yet the Saints, being glorified, doe ſee in God all things, *quæ nimirum ad ipſos pertinent*, viz. which doe belong unto them. But *Gregory* upon thoſe words of *Job* ſaith thus, *As they that are alive, know not where the ſoules of the dead are; ſo they that are dead, know not how they live that are after them.* Indeed hee addes preſently after, *This yet is not to be thought of the holy ſoules, becauſe they that ſee the brightneſſe of Almighty God, are by no meanes to be thought ignorant of any thing beſides.* Therefore he underſtands *Job* as ſpeaking onely of ſuch dead perſons, as are unholy, whereas indeed *Jobs* words are indefinite, and indifferently to be underſtood of all that are dead, except by ſpeciall Revelation any thing done here below be made known unto them. *Thou deſtroyeſt the hope of man*, v. 19. *viz.* his hope of continuing here in this life. *Thou changeſt his countenance, and ſendeſt him away*, v. 20. This holdes in reſpect of all: and then followes, *His ſonnes come to honour, and hee knoweth it not*, &c. v. 21. So that the coherence of the words ſhews, that they are meant generally of all that are deceaſed. And that which *Gregory* ſaith of the Saints, that ſeeing God, in him they ſee all things, *Bellarmine* himſelfe (it ſeemes) did thinke too laviſh, and therefore he limits it to all things which concerne them, or belong unto them. Which limitation doth indeed mar his market; for how doth it appeare, that it belongs unto the Saints departed to underſtand particular occurrences here below, and namely all the prayers that any ſhall make unto them? which is the ſcope, that they of the Church of *Rome* aime at, when

Sicut enim hi, qui adhuc viventes ſunt, mortuorũ animæ quo loco habeantur, ignorant: ita mortui vitam in carne viventium poſt eos qualiter diſponatur, neſciunt. *Greg. Moral. lib. 12. cap. 14.*

Quod tamen de animabus ſanctis ſentiendum non eſt: quia quæ omnipotentis Dei claritatem vident, nullo modo credendum eſt, quia foris ſit aliquid, quod ignorent. *Greg. Ibid.*

when they ſpeake of the Saints knowing things here on Earth: but of that more (God willing) hereafter. But for the Saints knowing our affaires, it was (it ſeemes) in the time of *Lombard* (above 1100 years after Chriſt) a point not much believed; For *Lombard* moving the queſtion, ſaith onely this, *It is not incredible that the ſoules of the Saints enjoying the viſion of God, doe underſtand humane and earthly affaires, ſo far as concernes their joy, and our helpe.* Hee doth not ſay, that this is certaine, but onely that it is not incredible. And *Bellarmine* himſelfe relating foure ſeverall opinions about the manner how the Saints know things here upon Earth, of two of them, *viz.* that they know them by the relation of Angels, or by being after a ſort every where preſent, hee ſaith plainly, that neither of them doth ſatisfie, and gives convincing Reaſons for it.

Non eſt incredibile animas ſanctorum quæ in abſcondito faciei dei veri luminis illuſtratione lætantur, in ipſius contemplatione ea, quæ foris aguntur, intelligere, quantum vel illis ad gaudium, vel nobis ad auxilium pertinet. *Lomb. ſens. lib. 4. diſt. 45. lit. f.*

De modo aurem quo cognoſcunt, quatuor ſunt Doctorum ſententiæ, &c. *Bell. de Sanct. beat. lib. 1. cap. 20.*

Sed neutra eſt ſufficiens, &c. *Bellarmin. Ibid.*

And for the other two opinions, *viz.* that the Saints from the beginning of their bleſſedneſſe doe in God ſee all things that any way appertaine unto them: Or that God doth then reveale things unto the Saints, when any at any time doe pray unto them; hee likes not the latter of theſe, becauſe (hee ſaith) *If the Saints did neede a new revelation upon every occaſion, the Church would not ſo boldly ſay unto all the Saints, pray for us, but would ſometimes deſire of God to reveale our prayers unto them:* And for the other Opinion, which remaines, hee ſayes no more but onely that *it is probable.* So that wee ſee by our adverſaries owne confeſſion, they have no certainty of this, that the Saints in Heaven are particularly acquainted with things here on Earth. Some may ſay, that they are certaine that it is ſo, though they be uncertain how it comes to be ſo. I anſwer, indeed if the Scripture did affirme that ſo it is, then wee might and ought to be aſſured of it, though wee could not ſee why it is ſo. But the Scripture is

Si indigerent Sancti novâ revelatione, Eccleſia non diceret ita audacter omnibus Sanctis, Orate pro nobis, ſed peteret aliquando à Deo, ut eis revelaret preces noſtras. *Bellar. Ibid.*

Eſtque probabilis hæc ſententia. *Bel. Ibid.*

ſo

ſo farre from affirming it, that it denies it, as I have ſhewed; and therefore they that maintaine it, muſt both anſwer the Scripture where it is denied, and alſo by Scripture prove the contrary aſſertion, which they neither doe, nor can doe. That place cited by the Marqueſſe, *viz.* Luke 16.29. is not of force to prove it. For 1. Some Romiſh Expoſitors, and namely *Janſenius* doth confeſſe that it is doubtfull whether that which is ſpoken of the rich man and *Lazarus*, and ſo of *Abraham*, be any more then a Parable: and if it be a Hiſtory, and a Narration of a thing done, yet this (hee ſaith) muſt needs be confeſſed, that all things did not happen ſo as they are related. For that it is certaine that the rich man being in Hell, did not ſpeake with a Tongue, nor with bodily Eyes did ſee *Abraham*, and *Lazarus* in his boſome, nor did complaine of the ſcorching of his Tongue, nor did deſire water to cole it. Therefore (hee ſaith) Chriſt did accommodate himſelfe to our capacity, and declare the things of the life to come after the manner of the things of this life, ſo that thoſe things are to be underſtood allegorically and ſpiritually, whether it be a bare Parable, or a true Hiſtory. And for the words objected, he ſheweth that they are more eaſie to be underſtood, if this part of Scripture be taken not for a Hiſtory, but onely for a Parable. For then it may be ſaid, that Chriſt did feigne theſe things, which were not done indeed, onely to inſtruct and admoniſh thoſe that are alive, that they ſhould not think to excuſe their impenitency by this, that they were never informed of the eſtate of the life to come by any that did returne from it. That men might not thinke thus, he ſaith, that Chriſt did bring in the rich

Dubium eſt, an hoc exemplum ſit tantum parabola, &c. *Janſen. Concord. cap. 97.*

Si Hiſtoriam quis eſſe dixerit, & rei geſtæ narrationem; neceſſe eſt tamen fateatur, non omnia ſic contigiſſe ut narrantur. Certum eſt enim divitem in inferno non locutum eſſe linguâ, nec oculis corporalibus vidiſſe *Abraham*, &c. *Jan. Ibid.*

Ita ut corporalia, quæ poſt hanc vitam commemorantur, ſint allegoricè & ſpiritualiter accipienda, ſive ſit nuda parabola, ſive vera Hiſtoria. *Janſen. Ibid*

Si autem exemplum hoc non Hiſtoria eſſe dicatur, ſed parabola tantùm, facilior erit quæſtionis explicatio. Dici enim poterit hæc ſic à Domino conficta eſſe, cum ſic geſta non eſſent, tantùm ad erudiendum & monendum vivos, ne ſuæ impenitentiæ prætexant, quòd de ſtatu futuræ vitæ nihil unquam didicerint ex his, qui è futurâ vitâ redierunt.———Ideò quò hanc cogitationem Dominus caſtigaret, propoſuit hunc divitem oraſſe, ut *Abraham* ad fratres ſuos *Lazarum* mitteret, & vulgarem hanc hominum cogitationem expoſuiſſe, ut ſic *Abrahæ* cujus magna erat apud Judeos authoritas, reſponſum ſubiiceret quo talis cogitatio reprehenditur & confutatur.—Hic jam ergò *Abraham* hanc vulgi opinionem confutans reſpondit, Si *Moſen* & Prophetas non audiunt, &c, *Ian. Ibid.*

rich man, desiring *Abraham* to send *Lazarus* to his Brethren, that so he might also bring in the answer of *Abraham*, who was of great authority among the Jewes, by which answer that conceit is reproved, and confuted. For *Abraham* confuting that opinion of the common sort of people answered, *If they heare not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they believe, although one should arise from the dead.* Thus then that place doth not evince, that *Abraham* knew that the Jewes had the writings of *Moses*, and of the Prophets. 2. Suppose that part of Scripture to be a History, and that *Abraham* did indeed know that the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets were upon the Earth, yet it doth not therefore follow that hee knew all the severall things done amongst men. What God would please to reveale, hee might know, but how much that is, who can tell? yea the Romanists themselves do hold that neither *Abraham*, nor any other, during the time of the old Testament, did understand the estate of men here alive. Although the ground of this opinion of theirs be not good, *viz.* because as then they did not enjoy the blessednesse of the life to come, yet however this is sufficient to extort from them this place of *Luke*, and to shew that they by their own principles can draw no argument from it for their Purpose. For the Fathers which the Marquesse alledgeth, I can onely looke into *Hierome*, as being destitute of both the other; But I have here, and continually almost cause to complaine of the Marquesses quotations, they being so wide, as here, and in many other places they are. For there are 14. Chapters of this booke of *Hierome*, that is mentioned, but in which of these Chapters any thing to the purpose is to be found, is not expressed, yet with much adoe I finde that *Hierome* seemeth to suppose that *Paula* being dead knew this estate. But I finde in another place (*viz. Adversus Vigilantium* cap. 2.) that *Hierome* makes the Saints departed to be every where, and by consequence to know what is done any where.

Responderi potest, Abrahamum, Israelem, & alios Patres veteris Testamenti non cognovisse posteros suos viventes, quia nondum beati erant, &c. *Bellarm. de Sanct. beatit. lib. 1. cap. 20.*

Sequuntur agnum quocunque vadit; Si agnus ubique, ergo & hi, qui cum agno sunt, ubique esse credendi sunt. *Hieron. adverf. Vigilant. cap. 2.*

But * *Bellarmine* likes not to build upon ſuch a foundation, confeſſing that truly and properly to be every where, is a thing, that doth not belong either to the ſoules of men, or to the Angels.

* Ad cognoſcendas preces, quæ eodem tempore fiunt in diverſiſſimis locis, non ſufficit celeritas, ſed requiritur vera ubiquitas, quam nec Angelorum, nec hominum ſpiritibus convenire credimus. *Bell. de beatit. Sanct. lib.* 1 *cap.* 20.

Page 68. From the knowledge, which the Saints deceaſed are pretended to have of our affaires, the Marqueſſe paſſeth to their praying for us. This hee proves by Revel. 5. 8. *The* 24. *Elders fell downe before the Lambe, having every one of them Harpes, and golden Vials, full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints.* And by *Baruch* 3.4. *O Lord Almighty, thou God of Iſrael, heare now the prayers of the dead Iſraelites.* Hee addes alſo the teſtimonies of *Aug. Ser.* 15. *de verb. Apoſtoli, Hilar. in Pſal.* 129. *and Damaſ. de Fide l.* 4. *c.* 16.

Anſ. That the Saints in Heaven do not pray for us in particular, appeares by what hath beene proved already, *viz.* that our particular affaires are not knowne unto them. That they pray for us in generall, Proteſtants doe not deny: *about this wee doe not contend*, ſaith *Ameſius* againſt *Bellarmine*. And *Bellarmine* himſelfe cites the Apology of the Auguſtane Confeſſion granting thus much, that the Saints in Heaven doe pray for the Church in generall. But for that place *Revel.* 5.8. I ſee not how it makes for the purpoſe. For neither doth it appeare, that the 24. Elders there mentioned, are the Saints departed; nor, if they be, is it ſaid, that they pray for the Church here upon Earth. Indeed the Rhemiſts upon the place ſay, *Hereby it is plaine, that the Saints in Heaven offer up the prayers of faithfull and holy perſons in Earth, &c.* And hence they infer, *That the Proteſtants have no excuſe of their errour, That the Saints have no knowledge of our affaires, or deſires.* But there is no ſuch thing, as they ſpeake of, plaine by this place of Scripture, except (to uſe the Marqueſſes words) *it be margin'd with their own notes, ſenc'd with their own meaning, and enlivened with their own private ſpirit.*

Sancti orant pro nobis, ſaltem in genere] Neque de iſtâ propoſitione contentionem ullam fovemus. *Ameſ. adverſ. Bellar. de Invocat. Sanctor.*
Bell. de Sanct. beat. lib. 1. *cap.* 20.

Page 52. *and* 53. They take it for granted (as the Marqueſs alſo doth after them) that the Saints in Heaven are meant by the 24. Elders, and that the

that the Saints after mentioned, are the Saints upon Earth, whereas the former of theſe is ſo farre from being evident, that their own Jeſuite *Ribera* doth tell us, that *Concerning the 24 Elders the opinion of the Fathers, and of Expoſitors is ſo various, that the more one reades them, the more uncertaine he ſhall be.* And among other opinions hee ſaith that ſome by the 24. Elders underſtand the whole Church. This Expoſition indeed he diſlikes upon this ground, that the foure beaſts ſpoken of, are not comprehended in the 24. Elders. But he enervates this reaſon himſelfe, underſtanding by the 24. Elders the moſt eminent among the Saints in Heaven, and by the foure beaſts the foure Evangeliſts, who yet are of the number of thoſe eminent Saints, and ſo the foure beaſts are alſo part of the 24 Elders, onely (hee ſaith) they are mentioned apart by themſelves, as being out of that number, becauſe beſides the excellencie which is common to them with others, they have ſome excellency which is proper and peculiar to themſelves. By the thred of his own Expoſition it appeares, that his argument is of no force why the 24. Elders may not ſignifie the whole Church. And although hee make it to be without doubt, that the 24. Elders doe offer up the prayers of other Saints, *viz.* which are upon Earth, yet when it is ſaid, that the 24. Elders had *golden Vialls full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints*, Revel. 5. 8. I ſee not but that by *the Saints* there may be underſtood the 24. Elders themſelves as well as any others. If other Saints be meant, diſtinct from the 24 Elders, Maſter *Medes* Expoſition ſeemes probable, that by the 24 Elders are meant Miniſters, and by the foure beaſts the reſt of Gods people, and ſo here by the Saints, whoſe prayers are offered up by Miniſters, who in the publike Aſſemblies are the mouth of the people, and offer up their

De viginti quatuor ſenioribus tam varia Patrum & Expoſitorum ſententia eſt, ut quo magis leguntur, eò lector reddatur incertior. *Riber. in Apoc.* 4. 4.

Alii totam Eccleſiam, &c. *Ibid.*

Non eſſe totam Eccleſiam conſtat, quoniam quatuor animalia non numerantur in illis. —— At ſi quatuor animalia ſunt quatuor Evangeliſtæ, quomodo ſecernuntur à numero 24 Seniorum, cum ipſi maximè ad hunc numerum pertinere videantur, ut qui inter beatos omnes multum excellant? Reſpondeo non ſecerni ab illis, quaſi ipſi inferiores ſint, aut ad numerum illum, aut ad illam dignitatem pertinere non poſſint, ſed quòd dignitate quâdam præterea eminent, cujus cauſâ extra illum numerum conſtitui, & nominari debeant. *Riber. ad Apoc.* 4. 6.

Deinde ipſi offerunt orationes ſanctorum, haud dubium quin eorum, qui ſunt in terrâ. *Riber. ad Apoc.* 4. 4.

Mede on Revel. 4.

prayers unto God for them. But how ever it be, thus much may ſufficiently appeare by what hath beene ſaid, that the Romaniſts can evince nothing from this Scripture as to this point, that the Saints in Heaven doe underſtand the particular eſtate of men here upon Earth, and pray for them. For the other place alledged, *viz. Baruch* 3.4. I give this anſwer, that the Booke is not Canonicall, the Jewes, *to whom were committed the oracles of God* (*viz.* the Scriptures of the old Teſtament) *Rom.*3.2. *Luke* 16. 29. not owning it, as is obſerved by *Hierome*, who therefore did let it paſſe, as himſelfe teſtifieth.

Librum autem Baruch notarii ejus, qui apud Hebræos nec legitur, nec habetur, prætermiſimus. *Hieron. præfat. in Jer.*

For the Fathers that are cited, *Auſtine de verb. Apoſt. Ser.* 15. hath nothing, that I ſee, to the purpoſe. Neither hath *Hilary* in *Pſalme* 129. any thing about the Saints praying for us, but onely about the Angels carrying the prayers of men unto God, which hee fetcheth from the Booke of *Tobit*, but to that I have ſpoken before. Indeed in another place, *viz.* upon *Pſalme* 124. (which *Bellarmine* produceth) hee ſaith that *neither the guards of the Saints, nor the Munitions of Angels are wanting unto us.* But I ſee not how any more can be inferred from this, then that the Saints doe in generall pray for us, which wee doe not deny.

Sunt ſecundum Raphaelem ad Tobiam loquentem Angeli adſiſtentes ante claritatem Dei, & orationes deprecantium ad Deum deferentes. *Hil. in Pſal.* 129.

Sed neque deſunt ſtare volentibus ſanctorum cuſtodiæ, neque angelorum munitiones. *Hilar. in Pſal.* 124.

Neither doe the words of *Damaſcen* in the place quoted import more then thus, when he ſaith that the Saints departed *make interceſſions for us, and that therefore they are to be honoured by us.* This may well be underſtood of their praying in generall for us. A little before indeed hee hath that which doth not ſound well, *viz.* that *every good gift doth come downe from the Father of lights by them* (viz. the Saints departed) *to thoſe that aske in faith without doubting.* The Scripture teacheth us no ſuch thing concerning the Saints, but attributeth this honour unto Chriſt, that by

τὰς παῤ θεῷ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὰς ἐντευξεὶς ποιουμένους ἃ τιμητέον ; *Damaſc. de Fide lib.*4.*c.*16.

Πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ ἐκ τῆς πατρὸς τῶν φωτῶν δι' ἀγίων τοῖς ἀδιστάκτῳ πίστει αἰτοῦσι καλεῖσι. *Damaſ. Ibid.*

by him we obtaine of God whatſoever is good and needfull for us. *He that ſpared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how ſhall he not with him alſo freely give us all things?* Rom. 8. 32. But *Damaſcene*, though a man famous in his generation, yet is of no great antiquity, being (as *Bellarmine* computes) 731 years after Chriſt, and therefore his teſtimony is of the leſſe force, beſides that ſome of the Romaniſts, namely *Sixtus Senenſis* doth note him as in ſome point of faith erroneous, *viz.* about the proceeding of the holy Ghoſt.

Bell. de Eccleſ. Scriptor.

Sixt. Sen. Bibl. li. 6. Annot. 187.

But at length the Marqueſſe comes to our praying to the Saints, that being the marke aimed at a long time. *Wee hold* (ſaith hee) *that we may pray unto them; you not: we have Scripture for it*, Luke 16. 24. *Father* Abraham, *have mercy on me, and ſend* Lazarus, *&c. You bid us ſhew one proofe for the lawfulneſſe hereof, when here are two Saints prayed unto in one Verſe. And though* Dives *were in Hell, yet* Abraham *in Heaven would not have expoſtulated with him ſo much, without a* non nobis domine, *if it had beene it ſelfe a thing not lawfull. You will ſay, it is a parable: yet a jury of ten Fathers, of the grand inqueſt, as Theophil. Tertull. Clem. Alex. S. Chryſ. S. Jer. S. Amb. S. Auguſt. S. Greg. Euthym. and Ven. Beda, give their verdict, that it was a true Hiſtory. But ſuppoſe it were a parable, yet every parable is either true in the perſons named, or elſe may be true in ſome others. The holy Ghoſt tells us no lies, nor fables, nor ſpeakes not to us in parables conſiſting either of impoſſibilities, or things improbable.* Job 5. 1. *Call now, if there be any that will anſwer thee, and to which of the Saints wilt thou turne? It had been a frivolous thing in* Eliphaz *to have asked* Job *the queſtion, if invocation of Saints had not beene the practice of that time. The Fathers affirme the ſame, S. Dionyſ. cap. 7. S. Athan. Ser. de Annunt. S. Baſil. Orat. de 44. Martyr. S. Chryſ. Hom. 66. ad Pop. S. Hierome prayed to Paula in Epitaph. S. Paulæ, S. Maximus to S. Agnes Ser. de S. Agnete, S. Bern. to our bleſſed Lady.*

Page 69.

Anſw. This point of praying to Saints, the Marqueſſe (it ſeemes) made great account of, in that he beſtowed ſo many words about it: but the unlawfulneſſe of this practice is cleare enough by that which I have ſaid before about praying unto Angels. For I have demonſtrated both by authority of Scriptures,

tures, and alſo by teſtimony of Fathers, that prayer is to be made unto God onely. And if the Saints doe not know our affaires here below (as I have ſhewed that they doe not) then it muſt needs be abſurd and irrationall to pray unto them. Yea, although we ſhould but onely deſire them to pray for us, as here we deſire the prayers one of another. But whatever our Adverſaries ſometimes may pretend, yet they are farre from contenting themſelves with this liberty, though it be more then is allowed them. Their praying unto the Saints, is a worſhipping of them, as I have ſhewed before by their own confeſſion. *Bellarmine* alſo tells us, that when they ſay, the Saints are onely to be requeſted to pray for us, they doe not meane but that we may ſay, S. *Peter have mercy on me, ſave me, open an entrance into Heaven for me: give me health of body, give me patience, courage, &c.* So that we underſtand it thus, *Save me, and have mercy on me by praying for me: give me this or that by thy prayers and merits.* But what is this, but to diſplace Chriſt, and to ſet up Saints in his roome?

Notandum, cum dicimus, non debere peti à ſanctis, niſi ut orent pro nobis, nos non agere de Verbis, ſed de ſenſu verborum. Nam quantum ad verba, licet dicere, S. Petre miſerere mei, ſalva me, aperi mihi aditum cæli, item da mihi ſanitatem corporis, da patientiam, da mihi fortitudinem, &c. dummodo intelligamus, ſalva me, & miſerere mei orando pro me, da mihi hoc & illud tuis precibus, & meritis. *Bellar. de ſanct. beat. lib. 1. cap. 17.*

Their Pope *Leo* cited by their *Caſſander*, concerning this ſame point, hath taught a better leſſon, ſaying, *The Saints have received, not given crownes: and by the fortitude of Believers we have examples of patience, not gifts of righteouſneſſe.*

Accepere ſancti, non dedere coronas; & de fortitudine fidelium exempla nota ſunt patientiæ, non dona juſtitiæ. *Leo apud Caſſand. conſult. de merit. & interceſſ. ſanct.*

This *Caſſander* cites, ſhewing how ill it ſuites with the Romiſh practice, which hee (although a Romaniſt) complaines of as too exorbitant. *Bellarmine* takes it very ill that *Calvine* ſayes they pray unto the Virgin *Mary* to command her Sonne: with great indignation hee cries out, *Who of us doth ſay this? Why doth hee not prove it by ſome example?*

Dicit nos rogare Virginem, ut filium jubeat facere quod petimus. At quis noſtrum hoc dicit? Cur non probat ullo exemplo? *Bell. de beat. ſanct. lib. 1. cap. 16.*

But

But the forementioned *Cassander* plainly shewes that *Calvin* did not charge them in that manner without cause. *For* (saith hee) *it is come to that passe, that Christ now reigning in Heaven is made subject to his Mother, as they sing in some Churches, Pray the Father, and command the Son, O happy childbearing Woman, who doest expiate wickednesse, by the authority of a Mother command the Redeemer.* Hee tells us also, that as *Ahasuerus* told *Esther* he would give her half of his Kingdome, if she would aske it; so some famous men among them say, that Gods Kingdome consisting of Judgement and Mercy, God hath indeed given halfe of his Kingdome to the Virgin *Mary*, viz. that part which consisteth in mercy, reserving the other part unto himselfe, *viz.* that which consisteth of judgement. Whereby they intimate, that who so desires mercy, must seeke to the Virgin *Mary* for it, otherwise hee can expect nothing but judgement.

Quin & eò ventum est, ut etiam Christus jam in cælo regnans Matri subjiciatur: quomodo in nonnullis Ecclesiis canitur, Ora Patrem, & jube filio, O fælix puerpera, Nostra pians scelera, jure matris impera Redemptori. *Cassand. ubi suprà.*

Imò non defuerunt viri etiam celebres, qui assererent, id quod Hester Assuerus promisit se petenti, dimidium regni daturum, in Mariâ completum esse, in quam Deus regni sui, quod judicio & misericordiâ constat, dimidium, hoc est, misericordiam transtulerit, alterâ regni parte sibi retentâ. *Cassand. Ibid.*

And (as *Cassander* also complaines) all *Davids* Psalmes they have metamorphosed and transformed into *the Ladies Psalter*, as they call it, instead of *Lord* putting in *Lady*, and attributing that unto the Virgin *Mary*, which *David* attributeth unto God. As for example, *Lady, in thee have I put my trust. In the Lady do I trust. Save me O Lady, for I have trusted in thee. To thee O Lady have I lift up my soule. In thee O Lady have I trusted, let me never be confounded. Judge me O Lady, and discerne my cause. O Lady, thou art our refuge in all our necessity. Have mercy on me O Lady, which art called the Mother of mercy, and according to the bowels of thy mercies, cleanse me from all mine iniquities; Powre out thy grace upon me, and withold not thy wonted clemency*

Quid quod totum Psalterium sublato ubique Domini nomine in nomen Dominæ commutatum legimus? *Cass. Ibid.*

Domina in te speravi. *Psal.* 7. In Dominâ confido. *Psal.* 10. Conserva me Domina, quia speravi in te. *Psal.* 15. Ad te Domina levavi animam meam. *Psal.* 24. In te Domina speravi, non confundar in æternum. *Psal.* 30. Judica me Domina, & discerne causam meam. *Psal.* 42. Domina refugium nostrum es in omni necessitate nostrâ. *Psal.* 45. Miserere mei Domina, quæ mater misericordiæ nuncuparis, & secundum viscera misericordiarum tuarum munda me ab omnibus iniquitatibus meis, effunde gratiam tuam super me, & solitam clementiam tuam ne subtrahas à me. *Psal.* 50.

from

from me. And ſo all along throughout all the *Pſalmes* it runs after this manner. May we not now moſt juſtly apply that to the Romaniſts, which *Ambroſe* ſpake of the Heathens? *They thinke themſelves not guilty, who give the honour of Gods Name to the creature, and leaving the Lord adore their fellow-ſervants; as if there were any thing more, that might be reſerved for God.*

Et iſti ſe non putant reos, qui honorem nominis Dei deferunt creaturæ, & relicto Domino conſervos adorant; quaſi ſit aliquid plus, quod reſervetur Deo. *Ambr. in Rom.* 2.

Now for the Marqueſſes proofes, I marvell hee ſhould ſtand ſo much upon that in *Luke* 16.24. For 1. *Chemnitius* ſayes well, *Wee will not learne how to pray, of the damned, whom God hath caſt off, and who are in eternall deſpaire.*

Non igitur à damnatis, qui à Deo abjecti, & in æternâ deſperatione ſunt, diſcemus veram invocationem. *Chemnit. in Exam.*

And againe, *Let them pray as that rich man did, who would be heard, and helped as he was.*

Orent igitur cum divite illo, qui ita exaudiri, & juvari volunt. *Ibid.*

2. Whereas the Marqueſſe bringeth in a jury of ten Fathers, to prove that this Scripture is no Parable, but a Hiſtory, why ſhould wee be any more moved in this caſe with their verdict, then *Janſenius* a Romaniſt was, who (as I have ſhewed before) thought it more probable, that it is no Hiſtory, but a Parable: or at leaſt a Hiſtory related after a parabolicall manner? *Theophylact* alſo ſaith expreſſely that it is a Parable, and cenſures them as voide of underſtanding, who take it for a Hiſtory. His reaſon, I grant, is not good, *viz.* that as yet neither the juſt, nor the unjuſt doe receive their reward. And yet that aſſertion of his alſo is advantagious unto us in this point. For our Adverſaries hold (as hath beene noted before) that therefore in the time of the old Teſtament there was no praying to the Saints departed, becauſe the Saints then (as they ſay) were not in bliſſe, and ſo could not heare the prayers that ſhould be made unto them. Now *Theophylact* held, that the Saints in the time of the new Teſtament are not in bliſſe untill the laſt judgement, and the ſame was the opinion of many other Fathers. I know *Bellarmine* doth indeavour to free

Παραβολὴ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἐκ ὡς τινες ἀνοήτως ἂν οἰηθεῖεν, πρᾶγμά ἐστιν ἤδη γεγονός. *Theophylact. in Luke* 16.

ἀδέπω γὰρ ἔστι τοῖς δικαίοις τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἔστι τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς τῶν ἐναντίων ἡ ἀπολήψεσις. *Theophy. Ibid.*

Bell de Sanct. beat. l. 1. c. 4 & 5.

both *Theophylact*, and the reſt, interpreting them as if they meant onely in reſpect of full and perfect bliſſe both in ſoule and body. But others of the Roman Church doe confeſſe, that it was their opinion, that the ſoules of the righteous doe not enjoy the beatificall viſion untill the day of judgement. *Sixtus Senenſis* doth cite *Irenæus*, *Iuſtine Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Lactantius*, *Ambroſe*, *Auſtine*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, *Bernard*, and others, as being of this opinion: and therefore by our adverſaries, owne principles they could not rightly hold the Invocation of Saints deceaſed. But to returne to that Scripture, Luke 16. *Iuſtine Martyr* (as hee is cited by *Bellarmine*,) denies that it is a true Hiſtory. *Chryſoſtome* alſo ſaith plainly that it is a Parable, *Hom.* 1. *de Lazaro*. And yet hee is one of the Fathers, whom the Marqueſſe alledgeth to the contrary. I know not what that meaneth, which the Marqueſſe ſaith, *every parable is either true in the perſons named, or elſe may be true in ſome others*. For we do not finde perſons named in any parable beſides this; which is the maine, if not onely argument which is uſed to prove it a Hiſtory rather then a Parable: though *Janſenius* did not thinke this to be a convincing argument; and he ſhews two reaſons why the poore man was named, and not the rich, *viz.* 1. To teach us that God regardes the poore that are righteous, more then the rich that are wicked. 2. Becauſe when one is commended, it is meete to name him, but not ſo when one is condemned. And both theſe reaſons (hee ſaith) ſtand good, whether this narration be onely a Parable, or a Hiſtory. It is certaine, *the holy Ghoſt tells no lies, nor fables, &c.* Parables are not falſe, nor fabulous, yet * *Theophylact* ſaith well, *We muſt not take all things that are ſpoken in Parables, as Lawes and Canons.*

Sixt. Sen. Bibl. l. 6. Annot. 345.

Juſtinus quæſt. 60. ex iis, quas Gentes Chriſtianis opponunt, dicit narrationem de divite & Lazaro non eſſe veram Hiſtoriam. *Bell. de Sanct. beat. lib.* 1. *cap.* 1.

Narratio magis quàm parabola videtur, quando etiam nomen exprimitur. *Amb. in Luc.* 8. *cap.* 16.

Nomen proprium ipſius Lazari arguit eſſe Hiſtoriam, quamvis non efficaciter, ut infrà patebit. *Janſ. Concord. cap.* 97.

Atque utraque hæc ratio nominati mendici conveniens eſt, ſive exemplum hoc ſit nuda parabola, ſive etiam Hiſtoria. *Jan. Ibid.*

* Οὐ δεῖ πάντα τὰ ἐν παραβολαῖς λεγόμενα ὡς νόμους ἢ κανόνας παραλαμβάνειν. *Theophylact. ad Joh.* 3. *page* 410. *Edit. Rom.*

So *Maldonate* thought meete often to admoniſh this, as a thing moſt ſafe, that Parables are not to be handled too ſtrictly; that they are often broken by handling; and that here that doth happen, which is ſaid in the proverbe, *the too much wringing of the noſe bringeth forth blood.*

Tutiſſimum eſt, quod ſæpè moneo, non nimis preſſè tractandas eſſe parabolas: frangi ſæpè tractando; ſolereque hìc accidere, quod proverbio dici ſolet, ut qui nimium emungit, ſanguinem eliciat. *Maldon. ad Luc.* 15. 22.

The other place, *viz. Job* 5.1. is very inconveniently alledged by the Marqueſſe for invocation of Saints deceaſed. *Bellarmine* was more wary in citing it onely to prove, that Angels, whom hee there underſtands by *Saints*, may be invocated. *Theſe words* (ſaith he) *ſhew, that it was the cuſtome then to call upon the holy Angels for their patronage.* But to ſay (as the Marqueſſe doth) that it appears by theſe words, that they uſed then to call upon the Saints departed, is contrary to the tenet of the Romaniſts, who hold, that during the time of the old Teſtament praying unto the deceaſed Saints was not in uſe, becauſe then the Saints that departed out of this life (as they hold) did not goe to Heaven, nor enjoy happineſſe. But the truth is, thoſe words *Job* 5.1. *Call now, &c. and to which of the Saints wilt thou turne?* make neither for the invocation of Saints, nor of Angels, the meaning of *Eliphaz* being onely to convince *Job* that none is puniſhed as he was except he were wicked; and therefore he bids him ſhew any of the Saints, if hee could, that was ſo puniſhed as hee was. For this was the error of *Eliphaz* and the other two friends of *Job*, that they thought *Job* could not be a godly man, becauſe God did ſo afflict him. Therefore God ſaid his Anger was kindled againſt them, becauſe they had not ſpoken of him the thing that was right, *Job* 42.7. For the Fathers, which are here objected, the firſt, *viz. Dionyſ.* is cited *cap.* 7, but of what? For hee wrote diverſe Bookes. But his teſtimony is of little worth, it being uncertaine who hee was, and when hee lived, and this being evident to all that have any the leaſt taſte of him, that hee was not (as is pretended) that *Dionyſius* that is mentioned *Acts* 17. 34. which his fuſtian and bombaſt-ſtile doth ſuffi-

Indicant (hæc verba) tunc fuiſſe conſuetudinem invocandi patrocinium ſanctorum Angelorum. *Bell. de ſanct. beat. l.* 1 *c.* 19.

Ante Chriſti adventum, ſancti qui moriebantur, non intrabant in cœlũ, nec deum videbant, &c. ideo non fuit conſuetum, ut dicerẽtur, S. Abraham ora pro me. *Bell. Ibid.*

ſufficiently declare. The next is *Athanaſius*; but I finde no ſuch peece as *Ser. de Annunt.* either in his workes, as they are extant both in Greeke and Latine, nor in *Bellarmines* Index or Catalogue of them, which he hath in his Booke of Eccleſiaſticall writers; If perhaps the Marqueſſe meant * *Ser de Sanctiſſimâ Deiparâ*, *Bellarmine* in that ſame booke cenſures it as not belonging to *Athanaſius*, but to ſome other long after his time, and in ſome thing (as it ſeemes) not very ſound. *Baſil* I have not to peruſe, nor *Maximus*. * *Chryſoſtome* in the place quoted, *viz. Hom. 66. de Pop. Antioch.* doth indeed ſeeme to ſpeake for praying unto Saints to pray for us. But wee muſt remember how hee is reckoned among them, who held that the Saints departed are not yet in glory, and therefore if the Romaniſts will have him ſpeake agreably to this poſition, they muſt not have him for a patron in this cauſe touching the invocation of Saints. And upon the ſame ground muſt they alſo let goe *Bernard*, who is likewiſe noted for the ſame opinion; though the truth is, hee lived in very corrupt times, and therefore it is no marvell if hee did draw ſome dreggs; it is indeed a marvell, that hee was not more corrupted and infected then he was. There remaines onely *Hierome*, who in the end of his *Epitaph* or Funerall Oration concerning *Paula*, addreſſeth his ſpeech unto her, bidding her farwell, and helpe him with her prayers. But 1. I have ſhewed before, that *Bellarmine* doth overthrow the foundation that *Hierome* buildes upon, *viz.* that the Saints departed are every where, and ſo can heare and underſtand whatſoever any ſtand in need of, and deſire of them; which *Bellarmine* confeſſeth to be incompetible to any meere creature, as indeed it is, this being a property that belongs unto God only. 2. When the Fathers ſometimes ſpeak in that manner to the Saints deceaſed, their ſpeeches proceeded rather from affection then from judgement, and are *Rhetoricall* rather then *Theologicall* expreſſions. As appeares by that of *Gregory Nazianzen*, who in his firſt Oration

* That I finde to be it, by Bell. de Sanct. beat. lib. 1. cap. 19.

* Stat ſanctis ſupplicaturus, ut pro ſe apud Deum intercedant. *Chryſoſt. loc. cit.*

He lived 1130 yeares after Chriſt. Bell. de Eccleſ. Script.

Vale, O Paula, & cultoris tui ultimam ſenectutem orationibus juva. Fides & opera tua Chriſto te ſociant, præſens quod poſtulas facilius impetrabis. *Hieron. in Epitaph. Paul. in fine.*

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ τῶν μεγάλων Κωνσταντίνου ψυχὴ, καὶ εἰς ἀιδησις. *Nazianz. in Julian. orat. 1. circa initium.*

againſt *Julian* ſpeakes thus unto *Conſtantine*, who was then dead, *And heare O thou ſonle of the great Conſtantine, if thou haſt any ſenſe* (or underſtanding) *of theſe things.* Where the Greeke *Scholiaſt* notes that *Nazianzen* did imitate *Iſocrates* a Heathen Oratour; *This is ſpoken* (ſaith hee) *in imitation of Iſocrates, as if he ſhould ſay, If thou haſt any power to heare the things that are here ſpoken.* And obſerve how *Nazianzen* (whom *Hierome* calleth his Maſter) ſpake doubtfully, making it a queſtion, whether the Saints departed doe underſtand things here upon Earth. 3. *Auſtine* (who lived in the ſame time with *Hierome*) in his booke *of true Religion* ſpeaking of the Saints deparred faith plainly, *They are to be honoured for imitation, but not to be worſhipped for Religion.* And in the laſt booke of that famous worke intituled *Of the Ciy of God*, in the tenth Chapter of it, ſpeaking of the Martyrs, hee ſaith, that in the celebration of the Euchariſt they were mentioned in their place and order (*viz.* to praiſe God for them, and to ſtir up others to the imitation of them) but yet that they were not invocated, and that no prayers were put up unto them. This may ſuffice to ſhew how farre in this point they of the Roman Church are departed both from the Rule of Gods Word, and alſo from the judgement and practice of the ancient Fathers.

Ιεσεχλικὸν, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἐὰν τις ἐπαΐοις ἐτι τῶν ἐνθάδε ἀκούειν. *Scholiaſt. Ibid.*

Gregorius Nazianzenus præceptor meus. *Hieron. Catal. Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.*

Honorandi ſunt propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem. *Aug. de verâ relig. cap. 55.*

Uni Deo & Martyrum, & noſtro, ſacrificium immolamus; ad quod ſacrificium, ſicut homines Dei, qui mundum in ejus confeſſione vicerunt, ſuo loco & ordine nominantur, non tamen à ſacerdote, qui ſacrificat, invocantur. *Aug. de Civit. Dei lib. 22. cap. 10.*

Page 69. *We hold* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *Confirmation neceſſary; you not: We have Scripture for it,* Acts 8.14. *Peter and John prayed for them that they might receive the holy Ghoſt (for as yet he was falne upon none of them, onely they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jeſus) then laid they their hands on them, and they received the holy Ghoſt.* Where we ſee the holy Ghoſt was given in *Confirmation*, which was not given in *Baptiſme.* Alſo Heb.6.1. *Therefore leaving the principles of the Doctrine of Chriſt, let us goe on unto perfection, not laying againſt the foundation of Repentance*

tance from dead workes, and of Faith toward God, of Baptiſme, and of laying on of hands, The Fathers affirme the ſame, Tertul. de Reſur. S. Pacian. de Bapt. S. Amb. de ſacr. S. Hierome contra Lucif. S. Cypr. l. 2. Ep. 1. ſpeaking both of Baptiſme and Confirmation ſaith, Then they may be ſanctified and be the ſons of God, if they be borne in both Sacraments.

Anſw. Concerning *Confirmation*, the Romaniſts make it a Sacrament properly ſo called, of the ſame nature with Baptiſme, and the Lords Supper. The matter of this Sacrament they make to be a certaine Ointment compounded after a ſpeciall manner, and conſecrated by a Biſhop, wherewith the perſon to be confirmed, is anointed in the forehead in the forme of a croſſe. The forme of the Sacrament they make to conſiſt in theſe words, *I ſigne thee with the ſigne of the Croſſe, and confirme thee with the Chriſme* (or ointment) *of ſalvation, in the Name of the Father, and of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghoſt.* The effect of this Sacrament they ſay is to confer true ſanctifying grace, and that more abundantly then Baptiſme doth in reſpect of the ſtrengthening of the ſoule againſt the aſſaults of Satan. Now this Confirmation Proteſtants deny to be a Sacrament, as having no inſtitution, nor any ground for it in the Scripture. The Author of the Treatiſe intituled *De unctione Chriſmatis*, who goes under the Name of *Cyprian*, but appeares to have been ſome other, ſhewes that this anointing, which they uſe in confirmation, was taken up in imitation of that anointing which was uſed in the time of the Law.

Bell. de Confir. lib. 2. cap. 8. & 9, 10, & 11.

Nec tamen ceſſantibus his, quæ ritu antiquo inoleverant, cum jam in populo Chriſtiano circumciſio videretur damnabilis, & ſacrificia idololatriæ imputarentur, unctionis myſterium Religio Chriſtiana contempſit, &c.

Bonaventure alſo (who lived betwixt 1200 and 1300 yeares after Chriſt) held that *Confirmation* was neither diſpenſed, nor inſtituted by Chriſt.

Credo quòd illud Sacramentũ Chriſtus nec diſpenſavit, nec inſtituit. *Bona. in ſcnt. l. 4. diſt 7. art. 1 quæſt. 1. Et quæſt. 2.* Chriſtus hoc ſacramentũ non inſtituit.

And if it were not of Chriſts inſtituting, it can be no Sacrament properly ſo called, onely Chriſt (as the Councell of Trents Catechiſme doth acknowledge) being the Author and Ordainer of every Sacrament.

Patet unum eundemque Deum in Chriſto juſtificationis, & Sacramentorum auctorem agnoſcendum eſſe. — Perſpicitur Sacramenta à Deo ipſo per Chriſtum inſtituta eſſe. *Catechiſ. Trident. de Sacram.*

Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 7. can. 1. And therefore the Councell of *Trent* denounceth *Anathema* againſt all thoſe that ſhall deny any of the Sacraments to have been of Chriſts inſtitution.

For that *Acts* 8.14. 17. which the Marqueſſe alledgeth, it is nothing to their *Confirmation*. For 1. There was laying on of hands, but no anointing with *Chriſme*, nor ſigning with the ſigne of the Croſſe. 2. The giving of the holy Ghoſt there ſpoken of, was in reſpect of ſome extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghoſt, as ſpeaking with ſtrange Tongues, &c. as *Cajetan* himſelfe upon the place obſerveth; and he ſolidly proveth it by this, that *Simon Magus* ſaw that the holy Ghoſt was given by the laying on of the handes of the Apoſtles. Beſides, *Acts* 19.6. (which place *Bellarmine* doth joyne with the other) it is expreſſely ſaid, *When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the holy Ghoſt came on them, and they ſpake with Tongues, and prophecied.* That therefore, which the Scripture ſpeakes of the Apoſtles laying handes on ſome that had beene Baptized, and conferring the holy Ghoſt upon them, is far from proving that the Apoſtles did adminiſter the Sacrament of *Confirmation*, there being neither the matter, nor the forme, nor the effect of that pretended Sacrament. *Bonaventure* ſaith plainly, *The Apoſtles did diſpenſe neither the matter, nor the forme.* And for the effect, we have had already *Cajetans* Confeſſion, *viz.* that the effect of the Apoſtles laying on of their hands was a ſenſible giving of the holy Ghoſt, and therefore not that which they make the effect of *Confirmation*. For the other place of Scripture, *viz. Heb.* 6.2. what reaſon is there why by *laying on of hands* there mentioned, ſhould be meant the Sacrament of Confirmation, which they will have to be adminiſtred with an ointment made of Oile and Balſome; whereas that Scripture ſpeakes of no anointing? why may not that laying on of hands be the ſame with that, 1 *Tim.* 5.22. *lay hands ſuddenly on no man?* viz. the laying on of hands uſed in the ordination of Miniſters: which alſo wee reade of 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. and 2 *Tim.* 1.6. Or that laying on of hands, which is mentioned *Acts* 8. and 19. whereby (as hath beene ſhewed)

Accepiſſe eos Sp. S. in effectu ſenſibili (puta locutione linguarum) teſtantur ſubjuncta, quòd Simon qui fuerat Magus, viderit Spiritum S. datum per impoſitionem manuum. *Cajet. ad. loc. Bell. de Confir. lib. 2. cap. 2.*

Nec materiam, nec formam Apoſtoli diſpenſaverunt. *Bonav. lib. 4. diſt. 7. art. 1. quæſt. 2.*

ſhewed) the extraordinary and ſenſible gifts of the holy Ghoſt were conferred upon Believers? Thus * *Theophylact* upon the place expounds it, of laying on of hands, whereby they received the holy Ghoſt ſo as to foretell things to come, and to worke miracles. † *Cajetan* alſo underſtands it in like manner, of that laying on of hands, which was peculiar to thoſe Primitive Chriſtians.

* Impoſitionis quoque manuum, Quâ ſcil. & Spiritum S. accipiebant, cujus gratiâ & futura prædicerent, & miracula ederent. *Theophyl. ad loc.* † Et hoc ad prima fidei fundamenta in primitivâ Eccleſiâ ſpectabat. *Cajet. ad loc.*

For the Fathers alledged, it is granted, that the Fathers doe often ſpeake of anointing, and that they ſpeake of it as of a Sacrament. But diverſe things are to be conſidered;

1. That the word *Sacrament* is by ancient Writers taken very largely. *Bellarmine* confeſſeth that in the vulgar Latine Tranſlation of the Scriptures the word is uſed of many things that by the conſent of all are no Sacraments properly ſo called.

Invenimus nomen Sacramenti in Scripturis tribui multis rebus, quæ omniũ conſenſu non ſunt Sacramenta, de qualibus nunc agimus. *Bell. de effect. ſacram. l. 2. c. 24.*

So *Caſſander* ſaith that beſides thoſe ſeven which the Church of *Rome* accounteth Sacraments, there are ſome other things uſed among them, which by a more large acception of the word are ſometimes called Sacraments. And that of thoſe ſeven Sacraments it is certaine the Schoolemen themſelves did not thinke them all to be alike properly called Sacraments. And he inſtanceth in this very Sacrament of confirmation, ſhewing that ſome of the Schoolmen (namely *Holcot*) did not take it for a Sacrament of like nature with Baptiſme.

Et extra hunc numerum quædam ſunt in Eccleſiâ celebrata ſigna; quæ & ipſa latioris vocis notione Sacramenta nonnunquam dicuntur. Et de his quoque ſeptem Sacramentis certum eſt, ne ipſos quidem Scholaſticos exiſtimaſſe omnia ea æquè propriè Sacramenta vocari. Nam et de confirmatione quidam ſcripſerunt, gratiam confirmationis non eſſe univocè gratiam cum illâ, &c. *Caſſand. Conſult. artic. 13.*

The ſame Author tells us, that one ſhall hardly finde any before *Peter Lombard* (who was 1145 yeares after CHRIST) that did ſet downe a certaine and determinate number of the Sacraments.

Nec temerè quenquam reperias ante Pet. Lombardum, qui certum aliquem & definitum numerum Sacramentorum ſtatuerunt. *Caſſand. Ibid.*

But

But the Councell of Trent hath decreed, *If any ſhall ſay, that the Sacraments of the new Teſtament were not all inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord; or that they are either more or leſſe then ſeven, viz. Baptiſme, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Penance, Extreme unction, Order, and Marriage; or that any of theſe is not a Sacrament truly and properly ſo called, let him be anathema.* We may ſee therefore of what ſmall ſtanding the preſent Roman faith is.

Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ legis non fuiſſe omnia à Jeſu Chriſto Domino noſtro inſtituta; aut eſſe plura, vel pauciora quàm ſeptem, viz. Baptiſmum, Confirmationem, Euchariſtiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem, & Matrimonium: aut etiam aliquod horum non eſſe verè, & propriè ſacramentum, anathema ſit. *Concil. Trident. ſeſſ. 7. can. 1.*

τῶ ἐλάτε τὸν χείσιν τὶς λόγω γεγεαμμένω ἐδίδαξε; *Baſil de Spir. S. cap. 37.*

2. Some of the Fathers doe expreſſely tells us, that the anointing, which they uſed, hath no foundation in the Scripture. *Baſil* ſpeaking of it, askes, *What written word hath taught it?* And ſo *Bellarmine* confeſſeth that there is no inſtitution of it in the Scripture, and that they have it onely by Tradition, which yet hee ſaith is moſt certaine, and no leſſe to be believed then the written word it ſelfe. But we are bidden goe *to the Law, and to the Teſtimony*; and are told, *that if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them.* Iſai. 8. 20.

3. The Fathers ſo peake of their anointing, as that they ſeeme to make it onely an Appendix of Baptiſme. *Wee came to the water; thou wenteſt in* (ſaith *Ambroſe*) then preſently hee addes, *Thou waſt anointed as a wreſtler.*

Venimus ad fontem, ingreſſus es— Unctus es quaſi athleta. *Ambroſ. de Sacram. l. 1. c. 2.*

So *Tertullian*, *Being come out of that laver wee are anointed with the bleſſed anointing.*

Exinde egreſſi de lavacro perungimur benedictâ unctione. *Tertull. de Baptiſ. c. 8.*

I know *Pamelius* makes that anointing there ſpoken of by *Tertullian* diſtinct from that uſed in Confirmation: but *Bellarmine* cites thoſe words as meant of confirmation.

Pamel. Annot. in Tertull. Bellarm. de Confirm. lib. 2. cap. 6.

So thoſe very words of *Cyprian*, which the Marqueſſe citeth, *Then they bee fully ſanctified, and be the Sonnes of God, if they be borne of both Sacrammentes*; thoſe very words,

Tunc enim demùm plenè ſanctificari, & eſſe filii Dei poſſunt, ſi ſacramento utroque naſcantur. *Cypr. lib. 2. Epiſt. 1. five edit. Pamel. Epiſt. 71.*

wordes, I ſay, doe argue that *Cyprian* though he ſeeme to ſpeak of two Sacraments, yet indeed accounted them but one Sacrament, in that he makes one and the ſame effect of both, *viz. to be borne*, whereas they of *Rome* make *birth* onely the effect of Baptiſme, and *ſtrength* the effect of Confirmation. Neither doth it follow that in *Cyprians* judgement they are two diſtinct Sacraments, becauſe hee ſaith *both Sacraments*. For ſo he might ſpeak in reſpect of two ſeverall ſignes, though both uſed in one and the ſame Sacrament; Even as *Rabanus* calleth the body and blood of Chriſt two Sacraments; he means the conſecrated bread and wine, which though they make but one Sacrament, yet becauſe they are two ſacramentall ſignes, he calles them two Sacraments.

Corpus & ſanguis Domini in duo Sacramenta ſecantur; quod apertè fit à Rabano. *Caſſand. Conſult. art.* 13.

4. Whereas the Fathers uſed to adde Confirmation preſently after Baptiſme, whether it were one of years, or an infant that was Baptized, as is acknowledged by *Bellarmine*, and other Romaniſts: now they thinke it not meete to Confirme children untill they come to the uſe of reaſon, and be able to confeſſe their faith. The Catechiſme ſet forth by the decree of the councell of Trent, thinkes it requiſite, that children be either twelve years old, or at leaſt ſeven years old before they be confirmed. And * *Durantus* tells us that a Synod at *Millan* did decree (and that, hee ſayes, piouſly and religiouſly) That the Sacrament of Confirmation ſhould be adminiſtred to none under ſeven years old. Thus have they (by their own confeſſion) departed from the judgment and practice of the ancient Fathers themſelves; and why then ſhould they preſſe us with it?

Bell. de Confir. lib. 2. *c.* 7. *Durant. de ritib. l.* 1. *c.* 20.

Hoc tempore cum Baptizantur adulti, eodem die datur Baptiſmus, Confirmatio, & Euchariſtia, ut veteres faciebant: ſed cum Baptizantur infantes, differuntur alia duo Sacramenta, donec ad uſum rationis pervenerint, &c. *Bell. Ibid.* Summâ ratione receptum eſt, quicquid Gerſon cenſeat, hoc ſacramentum mininè conferri antequam pueri rationis uſum habuerint, & fidem ſuam confiteri poſſint. *Durant. Ibid.* Si duodecimus annus non expectandus videatur uſque ad ſeptimum certè hoc Sacramentum differre, maximè convenit. *Catech. Trident. de Confirmat.* * Piè & Religioſè Synodus Mediolanenſis Anno 1565. decrevit, minori ſeptennio Confirmationis ſacramentum minimè præbendum. *Durant. ubi ſupra.*

After Confirmation the Marqueſſe commeth to communicating in one kinde, which they hold ſufficient. And he ſaith that they have Scripture for it, *viz. Joh.* 6. 51. (not 15.) *If any man* *Page* 70.

 eate

eate of this bread, hee ſhall live for ever. Whence hee inferrs, *If everlaſting life be ſufficient, then it is alſo ſufficient to communicate under one kinde.* So *Acts* 2.42. *They continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and fellowſhip, and in breaking of bread, and prayer.* Where is no mention of the Cup, and yet they remained ſtedfaſt in the Apoſtles Doctrine. So alſo *Luke* 24.30,35. Where Chriſt communicated (hee ſaith) his two Diſciples under one kinde. He addes, that *Auſtine, Theophylact*, and *Chryſoſtome* expound that place of the Sacrament.

Anſw. The Scripture plainly ſhewes, that our Saviour inſtituting the Sacrament of his Supper, took, and bleſſed, and gave the Cup as well as the bread, and commanded that to be drunk as well as this to be eaten in remembrance of him. *Mat.* 26. *Mar.* 14. *Luke* 22. 1 *Cor.* 11. And the Apoſtle tells us, that, *As oft as we eate this bread, and drinke the Cup of the Lord, we ſhew forth the Lords death till he come.* 1 *Cor.* 11.26. And he bids *v.*28. *Let a man examine himſelfe, and ſo let him eate of that Bread, and drinke of that Cup.* Proteſtants therefore have good reaſon to hold it neceſſary to communicate in both kindes, and that it is utterly unlawfull to withold the Cup from people, as they in the Church of *Rome* do. Our Adverſaries thinke to put off thoſe words of our Saviour, *Drinke yee all of this*, by ſaying that Chriſt ſpake ſo onely to the Apoſtles, and therefore wee muſt not infer from them, that the common ſort of people are to drinke of the Cup in the Sacrament. But 1. by this reaſon they may as well withhold the bread alſo from the people, and ſo deprive them of the whole ſacrament. For when Chriſt gave the Bread, and bad *take, eate*, he ſpake onely to the Apoſtles, as well as when hee gave the cup, and bad that all ſhould drinke of it. 2. The Apoſtle ſpake univerſally of all Chriſtians, requiring that having examined themſelves they ſhould not onely eate of the bread, but drinke of the cup alſo. All antiquity is here on our ſide. *How doe we teach, or provoke them (* ſaith * *Cyprian) to ſhed their blood in the confeſſion of*

Hæc verba (Bibite ex hoc omnes) dicuntur ſolis Apoſtolis, &c. *Bell. de Euchar. lib.* 4. *cap.* 25.

* Quomodo docemus, aut provocamus eos in confeſſione nominis ſanguinem ſuum fundere, ſi eis militaturis Chriſti ſanguinem denegamus? Aut quomodo ad Martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, ſi non eos priùs ad bibendum in Eccleſiâ poculum Domini jure communionis admittimus? *Cypr. Epiſt.* 54. *edit. Pamel.*

Chriſt

Christ, if we deny them the blood of Christ, when they are going to war-fare? Or how doe we make them meete for the Cup of Martyrdome, if we doe not first admit them to drinke the Lords Cup in the Church by the right of Communion? Thus spake *Cyprian* (and he spake in the name of a whole Synod of *Affrick*, as *Pamelius* observes) concerning such as though they had grossely offended, yet were judged meete to be admitted to the Sacrament because of a persecution, which was ready to come upon them, that so they might be strengthened and prepared for it. This clearly shewes, that in *Cyprians* time all that did communicate at all, did communicate in both kindes, and not in one onely. So also in another place, *Considering* (saith *Cyprian*) *that they therefore daily drinke the cup of Christs Blood, that they also for Christ may shed their blood.* There is a decree of Pope *Julius* recorded by *Gratian*, wherein hee condemneth the practice of some, who used to give unto people the bread dipped for a full communion. This he saith is not consonant to the Gospell, where we finde that the bread and the cup were given severally, each by it selfe. Much more, we may suppose, hee would have disliked that the bread alone, without any manner of participation of the cup, should have been administred. Sure I am, the reason that hee alledgeth is every whit as much against this as against the other. So another Pope. *viz. Gelasius* (as the same *Gratian* relates) hearing of some, that would onely receive the bread, but not the Cup, bade that either they should receive the whole Sacrament, or no part of it, *because the division of one and the same mystery* (hee saith) *cannot be without great Sacriledge.*

Id Episcoporum statutum, totius Synodi nomine, nuntiat Cornelio Cyprianus; atque adeò non tam ipsius Cypriani, quàm Synodi Africanæ est hæc Epistola. *Pamel. in argum. epist.*

Considerantes idcircò se quotidie calicem sanguinis Christi bibere, ut possint & ipsi propter Christum sanguinem fundere. *Cypr. epist. 56.*

Illud verò, quòd pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex Evangelio testimonium receperunt, ubi Apostolis corpus suum commendavit & sanguinem. Seorsim enim panis, & seorsim calicis commendatio memoratur. *De consecrat. dist. 2 cap. Cum omne.*

Comperimus quòd quidam sumptâ tantummodò corporis sacri portione, à calice sacrati cruoris abstineant; qui proculdubio (quum nescio quâ superstitione docentur astringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia divisio unius & ejusdem mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire. *Ibid. cap. Comperimus.*

eate of this bread, hee ſhall live for ever. Whence hee inferrs, *If everlaſting life be ſufficient, then it is alſo ſufficient to communicate under one kinde.* So *Acts* 2.42. *They continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and fellowſhip, and in breaking of bread, and prayer.* Where is no mention of the Cup, and yet they remained ſtedfaſt in the Apoſtles Doctrine. So alſo *Luke* 24.30,35. Where Chriſt communicated (hee ſaith) his two Diſciples under one kinde. He addes, that *Auſtine, Theophylact*, and *Chryſoſtome* expound that place of the Sacrament.

Anſw. The Scripture plainly ſhewes, that our Saviour inſtituting the Sacrament of his Supper, took, and bleſſed, and gave the Cup as well as the bread, and commanded that to be drunk as well as this to be eaten in remembrance of him. *Mat.* 26. *Mar.*14. *Luke* 22. 1 *Cor.*11. And the Apoſtle tells us, that, *As oft as we eate this bread, and drinke the Cup of the Lord, we ſhew forth the Lords death till he come.* 1 *Cor.*11.26. And he bids *v.*28. *Let a man examine himſelfe, and ſo let him eate of that Bread, and drinke of that Cup.* Proteſtants therefore have good reaſon to hold it neceſſary to communicate in both kindes, and that it is utterly unlawfull to withold the Cup from people, as they in the Church of *Rome* do. Our Adverſaries thinke to put off thoſe words of our Saviour, *Drinke yee all of this*, by ſaying that Chriſt ſpake ſo onely to the Apoſtles, and therefore wee muſt not infer from them, that the common ſort of people are to drinke of the Cup in the Sacrament. But 1. by this reaſon they may as well withhold the bread alſo from the people, and ſo deprive them of the whole ſacrament. For when Chriſt gave the Bread, and bad *take, eate*, he ſpake onely to the Apoſtles, as well as when hee gave the cup, and bad that all ſhould drinke of it. 2. The Apoſtle ſpake univerſally of all Chriſtians, requiring that having examined themſelves they ſhould not onely eate of the bread, but drinke of the cup alſo. All antiquity is here on our ſide. *How doe we teach, or provoke them (* ſaith * *Cyprian) to ſhed their blood in the confeſſion of*

Hæc verba (Bibite ex hoc omnes) dicuntur ſolis Apoſtolis, &c. *Bell. de Euchar. lib.*4. *cap.* 25.

* Quomodo docemus, aut provocamus eos in confeſſione nominis ſanguinem ſuum fundere, ſi eis militaturis Chriſti ſanguinem denegamus? Aut quomodo ad Martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, ſi non eos priùs ad bibendum in Eccleſiâ poculum Domini jure communicationis admittimus? *Cypr. Epiſt.*54. *edit. Pamel.*

Chriſt

Christ, if we deny them the blood of Christ, when they are going to war-fare? Or how doe we make them meete for the Cup of Martyrdome, if we doe not first admit them to drinke the Lords Cup in the Church by the right of Communion? Thus spake *Cyprian* (and he spake in the name of a whole Synod of *Affrick*, as *Pamelius* obserues) concerning such as though they had grossely offended, yet were judged meete to be admitted to the Sacrament because of a persecution, which was ready to come upon them, that so they might be strengthened and prepared for it. This clearly shewes, that in *Cyprians* time all that did communicate at all, did communicate in both kindes, and not in one onely. So also in another place, *Considering* (saith *Cyprian*) *that they therefore daily drinke the cup of Christs Blood, that they also for Christ may shed their blood.* There is a decree of Pope *Julius* recorded by *Gratian*, wherein hee condemneth the practice of some, who used to give unto people the bread dipped for a full communion. This he saith is not consonant to the Gospell, where we finde that the bread and the cup were given severally each by it selfe. Much more, we may suppose, hee would have disliked that the bread alone, without any manner of participation of the cup, should have been administred. Sure I am, the reason that hee alledgeth is every whit as much against this as against the other. So another Pope. *viz. Gelasius* (as the same *Gratian* relates) hearing of some, that would onely receive the bread, but not the Cup, bade that either they should receive the whole Sacrament, or no part of it, *because the division of one and the same mystery* (hee saith) *cannot be without great Sacriledge.*

Id Episcoporum statutum, totius Synodi nomine, nuntiat Cornelio Cyprianus; atque adeò non tam ipsius Cypriani, quàm Synodi Africanæ est hæc Epistola. *Pamel. in argum. epist.*

Considerantes idcircò se quotidie calicem sanguinis Christi bibere, ut possint & ipsi propter Christum sanguinem fundere. *Cypr. epist. 56.*

Illud verò, quòd pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex Evangelio testimonium receperunt, ubi Apostolis corpus suum commendavit & sanguinem. Seorsim enim panis, & seorsim calicis commendatio memoratur. *De consecrat. dist. 2 cap. Cum omne.*

Comperimus quòd quidam sumptâ tantummodò corporis sacri portione, à calice sacrati cruoris abstineant; qui proculdubio (quum nescio quâ superstitione docentur astringi) aut integra Sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur. Quia divisio unius & ejusdem mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire. *Ibid. cap. Comperimus.*

Nec ſuperfluit hæc, vel illa ſumptio. Nam ſpecies panis ad carnem, & ſpecies vini ad animam refertur; cum vinum ſit ſacramentum ſanguinis, in quo eſt ſedes animæ; ideóque ſumitur ſub utraque ſpecie, ut ſignificetur quòd utrumque Chriſtus aſſumpſit, carnem & animam, & quòd tam animæ quàm corpori participatio valeat: unde ſi ſub unâ tantum ſpecie ſumeretur, ad tuitionem alteriùs tantùm valere ſignificaretur. *Gloſſa Ibid.*

And whereas they ſpeake of a concomitancy of the blood with the body, and ſo would have it ſufficient to receive the bread onely, the gloſſe upon that canon is expreſſely againſt them, ſaying, that the bread hath reference onely to Chriſts Body, and the Wine onely to his Blood: and that therefore the Sacrament is received in both kindes to ſignifie that Chriſt aſſumed both Body and Soule, and that the participation of the Sacrament is available both to Soule and Body. *Wherefore* (it ſaith) *if the Sacrament ſhould be received onely in one kinde* (in Bread onely) *it would ſhew that it availes onely for the good of the one*, viz. of the Body, *and not for the good of the other*, viz. of the Soule. Not to multiply teſtimonies, * *Caſſander* in the very beginning of the Article, wherein he treates of this point, ingenuouſly confeſſeth that *the Univerſall Church of Chriſt to this day doth, and the Weſterne or Roman Church for more then a thouſand years after Chriſt did* (*eſpecially in the ſolemne and ordinary diſpenſation of the Sacrament*) *exhibit both kindes, both Bread and Wine to all the members of Chriſt; which* (he ſaith) *is manifeſt by innumerable teſtimonies of ancient Writers both Greek and Latine.*

* De adminiſtratione ſacræ ſancti Sacramenti Euchariſtiæ ſatis compertum eſt, Univerſalem Chriſti Eccleſiam in hunc uſque diem, Occidentalem verò ſeu Romanam mille ampliùs à Chriſto annis in ſolenni præſertim & ordinariâ hujus ſacramenti diſpenſatione utramque panis & vini ſpeciem omnibus Chriſti membris exhibuiſſe: id quod ex innumeris veterum ſcriptorum tam Græcorum quàm Latinorum teſtimoniis manifeſtum eſt. *Caſſand. Conſult. art. 22.*

Atque ut ita facerent inductos fuiſſe, primùm inſtituto exemplóque Chriſti, qui hoc ſacramentum corporis & ſanguinis ſui duobus hiſce panis & vini ſymbolis diſcipulis ſuis fidelium communicantium perſonam repræſentantibus præbuit: tum quia in ſacramento ſanguinis peculiarem quandam virtutem & gratiam hoc vini ſymbolo ſignificatam eſſe credebant: tum ab rationes myſticas hujus inſtituti, quæ à veteribus variè adducuntur,

And hee addes, that *they were induced hereunto, firſt by the inſtitution and example of Chriſt, who did give this Sacrament of his Body and Blood under two ſignes*, viz. *Bread and Wine, unto his Diſciples as repreſenting the perſon of faithfull Communicants. And becauſe in the Sacrament of the Blood they believed that a peculiar vertue and grace is ſignified. So alſo for myſticall reaſons of this inſtitution, which are diverſly aſſigned by the ancient*

ancient Writers. As to represent the memory of Christs Passion in the offering of his Body, and the shedding of his Blood, according to that of Paul, *As oft as yee eate this Bread, and Drinke the cup of the Lord, yee shew forth the Lords death till hee come. Also to signifie full refreshing and nourishing. which consists in Meate and Drinke, as Christ saith, My flesh is meate indeed, and my Blood is Drinke indeed. Likewise to shew the redemption and preservation of Soule and Body, that Christs Body may be understood to be given for the salvation of our body, and his Blood for the salvation of our soule, which is in the Blood. And so also to signifie that Christ tooke both Body and Soule, that he might redeeme both.*

viz. ad repræsentandam memoriam passionis Christi in oblatione corporis, & effusione sanguinis, juxta illud Pauli, Quotiescunque comederitis panem hunc, & calicem Domini biberitis, mortem Domini annuntiatis donec veniat. Item ad significandam integram refectionem sive nutritionē, quæ cibo & potu constat, quomodo Christus inquit, Caro mea verè est cibus, & sanguis meus verè est potus. Item ad designandam redemptionem & tuitionem corporis & animæ, ut corpus pro salute corporis, & sanguis pro salute animæ, quæ in sanguine est, dari intelligatur, Ad significandum quoque Christum utramque naturam assumsisse, corporis, viz. & animæ, ut utrumque redimeret. *Cassand. Ibid.*

And therefore hee saith, *It is not without good cause, that very many good men, even of the Catholike profession, being conversant in the reading both of Divine and Ecclesiasticall Writers, doe most earnestly desire to partake of the Lords cup, and by all meanes strive that this saving Sacrament of Christs Blood together with the Sacrament of his Body may againe use to be received according to the ancient custome of the universall Church, which was continued for many Ages.*

Quarè non temerè est, quòd optimi quique etiam Catholicæ professionis in divinorum & Ecclesiasticorum scriptorum lectione versati, & his quas supra diximus rationibus incitati, summo desiderio potiundi Dominici calicis incenduntur, omnibusque modis contendunt, ut hoc salutare sacramentum sanguinis Christi unà cum sacramento corporis juxta veterem & multis seculis perpetuatam universalis Ecclesiæ consuetudinem in usum reducatur, &c. *Cassan. Ibid.*

For the Scriptures which the Marquesse alledgeth, the first of them, *viz. Joh. 6. 51.* doth not concerne the Sacrament, which is not treated of in that Chapter, as I have noted before, and that according to the judgement of *Jansenius* a Romanist; to whom may be added diverse others of the Church of *Rome*, who (as *Bellarmine* confesseth) were of that opinion, *viz. Biel, Cusanus, Cajetan, Tapper*, and *Hesselius*. And even *Bellarmine*

Bellar. de Euch. lib. 1. cap. 5.

Non eſt controverſia an in toto capite agatur de Euchariſtiâ : conſtat enim non ita eſſe.——Solũ igitur quæſtio de illis verbis, Panis quem ego dabo, caro mea eſt pro mundi vitâ, & de ſequentibus ferè ad finem capitis. *Bellar. Ibid.*

Bellarmine himſelfe, and others, who hold that the Sacrament is ſpoken of in *Joh. 6.* yet hold it not to be ſpoken of till after thoſe words, which the Marqueſſe citeth, in thoſe words, which follow immediately after, *verſ.* 51. *And the bread, which I will give, is my fleſh, which I will give for the life of the World*; in thoſe words, I ſay, and the reſt that follow almoſt to the end of the Chapter, they ſay that our Saviour ſpeakes of the Sacrament, but not in any of the former words of the Chapter. And if the Sacrament were ſpoken of in that Chapter, thoſe words *v.* 51. *If any man eate of this bread, he ſhall live for ever*, would not ſo much evince a ſufficiency of communicating in one kinde, as the words a little after, *viz. v.* 53. *Verely, verely I ſay unto you, Except you eate the fleſh of the Son of man, and drinke his Blood, you have no life in you*, would evince a neceſſity of communicating in both kindes. For if thoſe words be underſtood of a Sacramentall eating and drinking, it cannot be avoided but that by thoſe very words, as it is neceſſary to eate of the bread in the Sacrament, ſo is it to drinke of the cup alſo. For though by the forementioned concomitancy of the blood with the Body, they ſay that when one kinde onely, *viz.* bread is received, the Blood of Chriſt is drunk as well as his Body is eaten ; yet (as *Janſenius* well obſerves) that outward act of taking the bread in the Sacrament cannot be called drinking. *It is rightly called eating* (ſaith hee) *becauſe ſomething is taken by way of meate : but how is it called drinking, when as nothing is received by way of drinke ?* Neither is it certaine that in the other two places, *viz. Acts* 2.42. and *Luke* 24.30. by *breaking of bread* is meant the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. *Cajetan* expounds the former place of ordinary bread, and the other place is expounded by *Janſenius* after the ſame manner.

Verùm non facilè apparet, quomodo exterior illa ſumptio poſſit dici bibitio. Manducatio enim rectè dicitur, quia ſumitur ibi aliquid per modum cibi : ſed quomodo bibitio, cum nihil ſumatur per modum potûs ? *Janſen. Concord. cap.* 59.

Cajet. in Act. 2. *Janſen. Concord. cap.* 146.

Docet (Janſenius) voluiſſe Dominum hoc exemplo demonſtrare fructũ & utilitatem Euchariſtiæ in unâ ſpecie. *Bell. de Euchar. l.* 4. *c.* 24.

Neither is it true that *Bellarmine* ſaith, that *Janſenius* teacheth that Chriſt by that example would ſhew the fruit and benefit of

of the Sacrament received in one kinde. *Jansenius* doth not speake of receiving the Sacrament in one kinde (though I know hee did approve of it) but onely saith, that *by the effect, that followed, the Lord would commend unto us the vertue of the Sacrament worthily received, to wit, that thereby our eyes are enlightned to know Jesus.*

Effectu hîc subsecuto commendare fidelibus Dominus voluit vim Eucharistiæ dignæ susceptæ, nempe quòd per eam oculi hominum illuminantur ad cognitionem Jesu. *Jansen. Concord. cap.* 146.

And whereas *Austine*, and *Theophylact* are said to understand that in *Luke* 24. of the Sacrament, *Jansenius* tells us, that so many thinke, but that indeed they did rather make mention of the Sacrament, because it was (not here spoken of in *Luke*, but), mystically commended and insinuated by our Saviour.

Ex quibus Theophylacti & Augustini sententiis apparet multis, illos sensisse Dominum jam impertiisse suis Eucharistiæ Sacramentum: verùm magis intelligendum eos hujus Sacramenti mentionem fecisse, quòd illud hîc à Domino mysticè fuerit commendatum & insinuatum. *Jansen. Ibid.*

But suppose that the Sacrament were spoken of in those places, as probably it is in *Acts* 2. because *breaking of Bread* is there joyned with *Doctrine* and Prayer, yet there is no sufficient ground for communicating in one kinde. For the figure *Synecdoche*, wherby the part is put for the whole, is not unusuall in the Scripture. Thus *Soule*, which is but a part of man, is put for man. *All the Soules that came with* Jacob, *&c.* that is, all the persons. *Gen.*46.26. So likewise *flesh* being a part of man, is used for man. *I will not feare what flesh can doe unto me. Psal.*56. 4. that is, *what man can doe unto me*, as it is expressed, *vers.*11. So whereas *David* saith, *In thy sight shall no man be justified*, Psal.143.2. *Paul* hath it, *There shall no flesh be justified in his sight.* Rom.3.20. Thus the whole celebration of the Sacrament may be termed *breaking of bread*, because that is one, and that an eminent part of it.

The Marquesse goes on still concerning the same Sacrament, but so as in the Church of *Rome* it is changed into a Sacrifice.

We hold (saith hee) *that Christ offered up unto his Father, in the Sacrifice of the Masse (as an expiation for the sinnes of the people) is a true and proper Sacrifice. This you deny: this We prove by Scripture, viz.* Mal.1.11. *From the rising of the Sunne to the going* Page 70.

going downe of the ſame, my Name ſhall be great among the Gentiles: and in every place Incenſe ſhall be offered to my Name, and a pure offering. This could not be meant of the figurative offerings of the Iewes; becauſe it was ſpoken of the Gentiles: neither can it be underſtood of the reall ſacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſſe; becauſe that was done but in one place, and at one time, and then, and there, not among the Gentiles neither. Which could be no other but the daily ſacrifice of the Maſſe; which is, and ever was, from Eaſt, to Weſt, a pure and daily ſacrifice. Luke 22. 19. This is my body, which is given for you, not to you: therefore a ſacrifice. The Fathers are of this opinion.

Anſw. That Chriſt is offered up in the Euchariſt a Sacrifice truly and properly ſo called, Proteſtants have good cauſe to deny. For the Euchariſt is a Sacrament, to be received by us; not a ſacrifice, to be offered unto God. Chriſt inſtituting the Sacrament, gave it to his Diſciples; hee did not offer up himſelfe as then unto his Father. The Scripture tells us, that *Wee are ſanctified through the offering of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt once for all.* Heb.10.10. And immediately after there it followes, that whereas the Leviticall Prieſts did *often offer the ſame ſacrifices, Chriſt having offered one Sacrifice for ſinnes, for ever ſate down on the right hand of God.* And *Heb.9.25, 26, 27, 28.* the Apoſtle proves that Chriſt was not to be offered often, becauſe his offering was his ſuffering; ſo that if hee ſhould have been offered often, then he ſhould alſo have ſuffered often. But (ſaith he) *as it is appointed unto men to die once, &c. So Chriſt was once offered, &c. Bellarmine* alſo averres, that *unto a true ſacrifice it is required, that the thing, which is offered unto God for a ſacrifice, be plainly deſtroyed, that is, that it ceaſe to be what it was before.* So that if Chriſt bee offered up in the Euchariſt, a true and proper Sacrifice, then hee muſt be deſtroyed, hee muſt ceaſe to be what he was before. Whether or no it be blaſphemy to affirme this of Chriſt, let all judge.

Ad verum ſacrificium requiritur, ut id quod offertur Deo in ſacrificium, planè deſtruatur, id eſt, ita mutetur, ut deſinat eſſe id, quod antè erat. *Bell. de Miſs. lib.1. cap. 2.*

Hoſtiam, quæ offertur, occidi & mactari neceſſe eſt: Ergo ſi Chriſtus ſingulis Miſſis ſacrificatur, eum

Bellarmine indeed afterward indeavours to anſwer this argument; Let us ſee what he ſaith. The argument hee propounds thus,

The

The ſacrifice, that is offered, muſt be ſlaine. Therefore if Chriſt be ſacrificed in every Maſſe, he muſt every moment in a thouſand places be cruelly ſlaine. To this hee anſwers thus, *The ſacrifice of the Maſſe is a moſt true ſacrifice, and yet doth not require the killing of that which is offered. For killing is only required in the offering of a thing that hath life, and which is offered in the forme of a thing that hath life, as when Lambes, Calves, Birds, and the like are offered, whoſe deſtruction conſiſts in death. But when the forme of the ſacrifice is of a thing without life, as of Bread, Wine, Frankincenſe, and the like, killing cannot be required, but only ſuch a conſuming of the thing as is agreeable to it. In the Maſſe therefore Chriſt is indeed offered, who is a thing having life; and he is offered in the forme of a thing having life, in reſpect of repreſentation where onely a death repreſentative is required, but not death indeed. But as he is a reall and properly ſo called ſacrifice, he is offered in the forme of Bread and Wine, according to the order of Melchiſedech, and therefore in the forme of a thing without life. --- Wherefore the conſuming of this ſacrifice ought not to be Killing, but Eating.*

ſingulis momentis mille in locis crudeliter interfici oportet ——Reſpondeo, Sacrificium Miſſæ eſſe veriſſimum ſacrificium, & tamen non exigere veram hoſtiæ occiſionem. Solùm enim occiſio requiritur in oblatione rei viventis, & quæ in formâ rei viventis offertur, ut cum offeruntur agni, vituli, aves, & ſimilia, quorum deſtructio in morte conſiſtit. At cum forma ſacrificii eſt rei inanimæ, ut Panis, Vini, Thuris, & ſimilium, non poteſt requiri occiſio, ſed ſolum conſumptio rei illi conveniens. In Miſſâ igitur offertur quidem Chriſtus, qui eſt res vivens, & offertur in formâ rei viventis, quantum ad repræſentationem, ubi ſolum requiritur mors Repræſentata, non autem mors reipſâ: ſed ut eſt ſacrificium reale, & propriè dictum, offertur in formâ panis & vini, juxta ordinẽ Melchiſedech, & proinde in formâ rei inanimæ.—— Quarè conſumptio hujus ſacrificii non debet eſſe occiſio, ſed manducatio. *Bell. de Miſſâ. l. 1. c. 25.*

I have rehearſed his words at large, that ſo his anſwer may be ſeene at full. But though there be many wordes, which hee uſeth, yet it is ſomewhat hard to know what hee meaneth. Certainly this is a very ſtrange kinde of ſacrifice, that he ſpeaketh of. Chriſt is offered up a ſacrifice both in the forme of a thing that hath life, and alſo in the forme of a thing that is without life. And as hee is offered in the forme of a thing that hath life, hee is onely offered in reſpect of repreſentation; but as he is offered in the forme of a thing that is without life, hee is really and indeed offered. So that Chriſt being offered in the forme of a thing that hath life, his death is repreſented; but he being offered in the forme of a thing that is without life, his

death is not represented, and much lesse is it really executed, and yet Christ is so really and properly sacrificed. These things do but very unhandsomely hang together. But whereas hee saith, that *the consuming of this sacrifice is the eating of it*, I demand, is Christs Body so eaten, as that it ceaseth to be what it was before? If it be not, (as certainly it is not, Christs Body being now glorified, and so free from all mutation) then is it not truly and properly sacrificed, *Bellarmine* himselfe telling us (as I have shewed before) that whatsoever is truly and properly sacrificed, is so destroyed, as that it ceaseth to be what it was before. To talke here of consuming the *Species* or forme of bread, so that it ceaseth to be what it was before, is nothing to the purpose; for they maintaine, that *the Body and Blood of the Lord are that sacrifice, which is properly offered and sacrificed in the Masse.*

Corpus & sanguis Domini sunt id sacrificium, quod in Missâ propriè offertur, & sacrificatur. *Bell. de Miss. l.1. c.27.*

And whereas *Bellarmine* also speaketh of Christs being offered in the forme of Bread and Wine, *according to the Order of Melchisedech*, I desire to know by whom CHRIST is so offered? For either by himselfe, or by the Priest that saith Masse. Not by himselfe; for here we speak of Christs being offered in the Eucharist, which is not administred by Christ, hee being now in Heaven. Nor by the Priest on Earth, there being no Priest after the order of *Melchisedech*, but Christ only. *Psal.*110.4. *Heb.*7.15, &c. And thus indeed there is no Priest upon Earth, that is properly so called; and consequently there is no true and proper sacrifice to be offered. For every sacrifice presupposeth a Priest to offer it; and such as the sacrifice is, such also must the Priest be; hee must be a Priest properly so called, if it be a sacrifice properly so called. But there is no such Priest upon Earth; there being none (as I have shewed) after the order of *Melchisedech*; nor yet any after the order of *Aaron*, for that order is abolished, as all the Leviticall sacrifices are. And of any other order besides these we read not in the Scripture.

Sacrificium est oblatio, &c. quâ res aliqua sensibilis, & permanens ritu mystico consecratur, & transmutatur. *Bell. de Miss lib. 1. cap. 2.*

Againe, in a sacrifice properly so called, it must be some sensible thing, (as our Adversaries themselves acknowledge) that is offered.

offered. But Christ is not sensible in the Eucharist; for by what sense is hee there discerned? And therefore neither is hee there truly and properly sacrificed. Neither was this Doctrine (*viz.* that Christ is properly sacrificed in the Eucharist) received in the Church of *Rome* for more then 1100 years after Christ, as appeares by the Master of the Sentences, * *Peter Lombard*, who propounds the question, *Whether that which the Priest doth, be properly a sacrifice, and whether Christ be sacrificed daily, or were only once sacrificed.* And to this hee answers that, *that which is offered and consecrated by the Priest, is called a sacrifice, and an offering, because it it a memoriall, and representation of the true sacrifice, and holy immolation, that was made in the Altar of the Crosse. And Christ died once on the crosse, and was there sacrificed in himselfe; but he is daily sacrificed in the Sacrament, because in the Sacrament there is a remembrance of that which was done once.*

* Post hæc quæritur, si quod gerit sacerdos, propriè dicatur sacrificium vel immolatio, & si Christus quotidiè immoletur, vel semel tantùm immolatus sit. Ad hoc breviter dici potest, illud quod offertur & consecratur à sacerdote, vocari sacrificium & oblationem, quia memoria est & repræsentatio veri sacrificii, & sanctæ immolationis factæ in arâ crucis. Et semel Christus mortuus est in cruce, ibique immolatus est in semetipso; quotidiè autem immolatur in sacramento, quia in hoc sacramento recordatio fit illius, quod factum est semel. *Lombard. lib. 4. dist. 12. lit. c. & f.*

Here we plainly see that he determines, that Christ is not properly sacrificed in the Sacrament, but improperly, in that his sacrificing of himselfe upon the crosse is remembred and represented in the Sacrament, which is no more then the Apostle saith, *viz.* that Christs death is shewed forth in the Sacrament, 1 *Cor.* 11. 26. And thus *Ambrose* (as *Lombard* doth cite him) *Although We offer daily, it is for the remembrance of his death.——We also offer now, but that which we doe, is a remembrance of the sacrifice which Christ offered.* To this purpose also he cites *Austine.*

Etsi quotidie offerimus, ad recordationem mortis ejus fit.——Offerimus & nunc, sed quod nos agimus, recordatio est sacrificii. *Ambros. apud Lombard. Ibid.*

Now for the places alledged by the Marquesse, the first, *viz. Mal.* 1. 11. doth not particularly concerne the Eucharist, but generally the spirituall worship and service, which the Prophet foreshewed should be performed unto God in the time of the New Testament, and which should not be confined and limited

to one certaine place, and as the ſolemne worſhip and ſervice of God in the time of the old Teſtament was, but ſhould be performed in every place, as well in one place as another. This is that which our Saviour ſaid to the Woman of Samaria, *Woman, believe me, the houre commeth, When ye ſhall neither in this Mountaine, nor yet at Ieruſalem worſhip the Father.*——*The houre commeth, and now is, when the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip the Father in ſpirit, and in truth, &c.* Joh.4.21,23. S.*Paul* alſo to the ſame purpoſe, *I will therefore that men pray every where, lifting up holy hands, &c.* 1 *Tim.*2.8. This is that *incenſe* and *pure offering*, which the Prophet *Malachy* ſaid ſhould be offered unto God in every place. This *incenſe* and *pure Offering* are *the prayers of the Saints*, Revel.5.8. And all *ſpirituall ſacrifices*, which Chriſtians offer *acceptable unto God thorough Jeſus Chriſt.* 1 Pet.2.5. What is this to prove that Chriſt is truly and properly ſacrificed in the Euchariſt? It is true, the * Fathers ſometimes apply that place of *Malachy* to the Sacrament of the Euchariſt; but not as if Chriſt were there in that Sacrament truly and properly ſacrificed, nor as if that place concerned this Sacrament more then any other ſpirituall worſhip now to be performed under the new Teſtament. *Irenæus* in one Chapter applies it to the Sacrament, and in the very next immediately after hee applies it to Prayer. Having cited the words of *Malachy*, *In every place incenſe is offered to my Name, and a pure offering*, immediately hee addes, *Now John in the Revelation ſaith that incenſe are the Prayers of the Saints.* So alſo * *Hierome* in his commentary upon the words of *Malachy*. *Now the Lord directs his ſpeech to the Jewiſh Prieſts who offer the Blind, and the Lame, and the ſick for ſacrifice, that they may know that ſpirituall ſacrifices are to ſucceed carnall ſacrifices. And that not the blood of Buls, and Goates, but incenſe, that is, the Prayers of the Saints are to be offered unto the Lord; and*

* *Iren. lib 4. cap. 32. Aug. de Civ. Dei lib. 18. c. 35.*

Et in omni loco incenſum offertur nomini meo, & ſacrificium purum. Incenſa autem Joannes in Apocalyp. ſ. orationes eſſe ait ſanctorum. *Iren. lib. 4. cap. 33.*

* Ergò propiè nunc ad ſacerdotes Judæorum ſermo fit Domini, qui offerunt cæcum & claudũ, & languidum ad immolandum; ut ſciant carnalibus victimis ſpirituales victimas ſucceſſuras. Et nequaquam taurorum hircorumque ſanguinem, ſed thymiama, hoc eſt, ſanctorum orationes Domino offerendas, & non in unâ orbis provinciâ, Judæâ, nec in unâ Judææ urbe, Hieruſalem, ſed in omni loco offerri oblationem nequaquam immundam, ut à populo Iſrael, ſed mundam, et in ceremoniis Chriſtianorum. *Hieron. ad Mal. 1.*

that

that not in one province of the world, Judea, nor in one City of Iudea, Hierusalem, but in every place is offered an offering, not impure, as was offered by the people of Israel, but pure, as is offered in the ceremonies (or services) *of Christians.* Here it is very observable, that *Hierome* writing professedly upon the place of the Prophet, to shew the meaning of it, was so far from thinking it to be peculiarly meant of the Eucharist, that hee doth not so much as mention that Sacrament, otherwise then it is comprehended in those spirituall sacrifices, which hee saith are here spoken of: but as hee saith, that spirituall sacrifices in generall are here signified, so particularly hee applieth the words of the Prophet unto prayer, saying that it is *the incense* which the Prophet speaketh of.

The other place of Scripture, *viz.* Luke 22.19. is as little to the purpose, though *Bellarmine* also doth alledge and urge it in the same manner, saying that Christ did not say, *Vobis datur, frangitur, effunditur, sed pro vobis,* is given, broken, shed *to you,* but *for you.* But what of this? Wee know and believe that Christs Body was given, and his Blood shed for us on the crosse, in remembrance whereof according to Christs institution wee receive the Sacrament: but doth it therefore follow, that Christ is properly offered and sacrificed in the Sacrament? The ground of this conceit is, that the word is in the present tense, *datur*, is given, not in the future, *dabitur*, shall be given. But this is too weake a foundation to build upon. For *Bellarmine* cannot deny, but that in the Scripture the present, or the preter tense is often put for the future. And well might it be so here, Christ being now ready to be offered, he instituting the Sacrament *the same night that he was betrayed*, 1 Cor. 11. 23. the night before hee suffered. And therefore Cardinall * *Cajetan* was much more ingenuous then Cardinall *Bellarmine.* For upon 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. he notes, that both the Evangelists, and also *Paul* relating the words of the institution of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, use the present tense *is given*, or *broken*, and *is shed*, because when *Christ* did institute

Bell. de Miss. l. 1. c. 12.

Illa verba temporis præsentis, &c. *Bell. Ibid.*

Fateor in Scripturâ sæpè accipi præsens, aut præteritum pro futuro. *Bellarm. Ibid.*

* At si præsentis temporis verbum, frangitur, in quæstionem quis deducat, animadvertat scripta ab aliis Evangelistis, & cessabit quæstio —— Eâdem siquidem ratione, quâ illi Evangelistæ futuram in cruce effusionem sanguinis significaverunt in præsenti,

effunditur : eâdem ratione Paulus futuram in cruce fractionem carnis Chriſti ſignificat in præſenti, dicendo frangitur. —— Communis autem omnium horum ratio (quarè ſcil. Dominus Jeſus in cænâ expreſſit futuram in cruce ſanguinis effuſionem, & carnis fractionem verbis præſentis temporis) eſt ut manifeſtaret diſcipulis, hujuſmodi effuſionem, & fractionem non diſtantem tempore, ſed tanquam præſentem eſſe. Et verè loquendo de tempore præſenti Grammatico more, tempus effuſionis & fractionis erat tunc præſens, quoniam jam inchoatum erat tempus paſſionis ejus. Ac per hoc ſicut inchoato die poteſt ſignificari verbo præſentis temporis quicquid fit illo die : ita inchoato jam die paſſionis ejus, potuit ſignificari verbo præſentis temporis omnis ejus paſſio. Præſens enim Grammaticè non eſt inſtans, ſed quoddam confuſum præſens. *Cajet. in* 1. *Cor.* 11.

the Sacrament, though his Body was not yet crucified, nor his Blood ſhed, yet the crucifying of his Body, and the ſhedding of his Blood was at hand, and in a manner preſent. Yea, the time of *Chriſts* ſuffering (hee ſaith) was then preſent, as being then begun. And therefore as when the day is begun, wee may ſignifie in the preſent tenſe whatſoever is done that day: ſo the day of *Chriſts* Paſſion being begun (the Jewes beginning the day at the Evening) all his Paſſion might be ſignified by a word of the preſent tenſe. The preſent being taken Gramatically not for an inſtant, but for a certaine time confuſedly preſent. The ancient Writers alſo have expounded the preſent tenſe (uſed in the words of the inſtitution) by the future.

* Audi ipſum tibi dicentem, quia hic eſt ſanguis meus, qui pro vobis effundetur, &c. *Origen. Hom.* 9. *in Levit. ab ipſo Bellarmino citatus lib.* 2. *Euchar. cap.* 8.

Heare Chriſt himſelfe (ſaith * *Origen*) *ſaying unto thee, This is my Blood, which ſhall be ſhed, &c.* So alſo † *Tertullian* rehearſeth *Chriſts* words thus, *This is my Body, which ſhall be given for you.* And even the vulgar Latine Tranſlation, *Mat.* 26. 28. & *Mar.* 14. 24. hath it in the future tenſe, *effundetur*, and ſo *Luke* 22. 20. *fundetur*, ſhall be ſhed : and 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. *tradetur*, ſhall be given.

† Hoc eſt corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur. *Tertull. lib.* 3. *in Marcion. citat. à Bellar. de Euchar. lib.* 2. *cap.* 7.

Now for the Fathers, whom the Marqueſſe alledgeth as being of their opinion, I anſwer, the Fathers indeed doe frequently uſe the word *ſacrifice*, and *offering*, when they ſpeake of the Euchariſt; but it doth not therefore follow, that according to their opinion there is a true and proper ſacrifice offered in the Euchariſt. For it is certaine that they doe alſo frequently uſe the ſame words, when they ſpeake of thoſe things which the Romaniſts

Romaniſts themſelves acknowledge to be no ſacrifices properly ſo called; even as the Scripture ſpeaketh of the ſacrifice of Prayer, *Pſal.*141.2. of praiſe, *Heb.*13.15. of Almes, *Heb.*13.16. of our own ſelves, *Rom.*12.1. And where the Fathers (as the Marqueſſe obſerveth) call the Euchariſt *an unbloodly ſacrifice*, they ſufficiently ſhew that properly Chriſt is not ſacrificed in it. For (as *Bellarmine* himſelfe doth tell us) *All ſacrifices* (properly ſo called) *that the Scriptures ſpeake of, were to be deſtroyed, and that by ſlaying, if they were things having life; and if they were ſolid things without life, as fine Floure, Salt, and Frankincenſe, they were to be deſtroyed by burning.* Beſides I have ſhewed before, by the teſtimony of *Lombard*, that the Fathers ſometimes expreſſely ſpeake of *Chriſts* being ſacrificed in the Euchariſt, in that there is a commemoration and remembrance of the ſacrifice which *Chriſt* upon the croſſe did offer for us. 1

Omnia omnino, quæ in ſcripturis dicuntur ſacrificia, neceſſariò deſtruenda erant, ſi viventia per occiſionem, ſi inanima ſolida, ut ſimila, & ſal, & thus, per combuſtionem, &c. *Bell. de Miſſ. l.*1. *c.*2.

* *Bellarmine* objects that Baptiſme doth repreſent the death of *Chriſt*; and yet none of the ancients doe ever call Baptiſme a ſacrifice: and therefore the repreſentation of *Chriſts* death alone could not be the cauſe why they call the Lords Supper a ſacifice.

* Baptiſmus eſt ſacramentum repræſentativum mortis Chriſti:—— Et tamen nulli veterum Baptiſmum ſacrificium Deo oblatum unquam appellaverunt. Non igitur iſta ſola repræſentatio cauſa eſſe potuit cur actio Cœnæ Domini ſacrificium appellatur. *Bell. de Miſſ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2.

I anſwer, doubtleſſe *Bellarmines* reading was ſufficient to informe him that diverſe ancient Writers call Baptiſme a ſacrifice. *Oecumenius* upon *Heb.*10.26. ſaith, that the meaning of thoſe words, *there remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſinnes*, is that there is no ſecond Baptiſme to be expected. For by *ſacrifice* (hee ſaith) is there meant the croſſe (*Chriſts* Sacrifice on the croſſe) and Baptiſme, wherein that ſacrifice is repreſented. After the ſame manner, and almoſt the ſame words writeth *Theophylact* upon that place to the Hebrewes. 2

ἐκ ἀναιρεῖ τὴν μετάνοιαν, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ τὸ εἶναι δεύτερον βάπτισμα ἀπαγορεύει. θυσίαν γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὸν σταυρὸν, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα καλεῖ. *Oecum. in Heb.*10.

Eſtius

* Chryſoſt. & ejus ſequaces per hoſtiam intelligunt aut Baptiſmum, aut potiùs mortem Chriſti, quatenus in Baptiſmo operatur. *Eſtius in Heb.* 10. 26.

* *Eſtius* alſo upon the place ſaith that *Chryſoſtome* and his followers by *ſacrifice* there underſtand either Baptiſme, or rather the death of Chriſt, as it doth operate in Baptiſme.

† Sed quæris quid cauſæ pleriſque antiquorum fuerit, ut Baptiſmum hoſtiam appellaverint, ideóque dixerint non ſupereſſe hoſtiam pro peccato, quia Baptiſmus repeti non poteſt. Sanè quia in Baptiſmo Chriſto commorimur, & per hoc ſacramentum applicatur nobis hoſtia crucis ad plenam peccati remiſſionem; hinc illi Baptiſma tranſlatitiè hoſtiam nuncuparunt, ac poſt Baptiſma ſemel ſuſceptum nullam hoſtiam eſſe reliquam interpretati ſunt, quia Baptiſma ſecundum non eſt. *Cau. Loc. Theolog. lib.* 12. *cap.* 13. *pag.* 680. *Edit. in* 8.

† And *Melchior Canus* affirmes, that moſt of the ancients did call Baptiſme a ſacrifice, ſaying that there remaines no ſacrifice for ſinne, becauſe Baptiſme cannot be repeated. And he gives this reaſon why they ſpake ſo, *viz.* becauſe in Baptiſme we die together with Chriſt, and the ſacrifice of the croſſe by this Sacrament is applyed unto us for full forgiveneſſe of ſinnes. *Therefore* (ſaith he) *by a metaphore they called Baptiſme a ſacrifice, and ſaid that after Baptiſme there remaineth no ſacrifice, becauſe there is no ſecond Baptiſme.*

Thus then it may ſufficiently appeare, that there is nothing either in the Scriptures, or in the Fathers, to prove that in the Euchariſt Chriſt is offered up unto the Father a ſacrifice properly ſo called, but that both Scriptures and Fathers are againſt it.

Page 71. In the next place, *VVe ſay* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *that the Sacrament or Orders confers grace upon thoſe, on whom the hands of the Presbytery are impoſed: you both deny it to be a Sacrament, notwithſtanding the holy Ghoſt is given unto them thereby; and alſo you deny that it confers any interior grace at all upon them. VVe have Scripture for what we hold,* viz. 1 Tim. 4. 14. *Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, and with laying on the hands of the Presbytery. So* 2 Tim. 1. 6. *Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands.* S. *Aug. lib.* 4. *Quæſt. ſuper Num.* S. *Cypr. Epiſt. ad Magnum. Optat. Milevit. the place beginneth, Ne quis miretur. Tertull. in Præſcript. the place beginneth, Edant origines.*

Anſ.

Answ. That *Orders* (or the * Ordination of Ministers) is a Sacrament truly and properly so called, of the same nature with Baptisme and the Lords Supper, they of the Church of *Rome* do hold, and the Councell of Trent hath denounced *Anathema* against such as deny it. † Protestants on the other side, though they doe not deny but that the name of Sacrament largely taken may be given to Ordination, yet they deny that it is a Sacrament in that sense as Baptisme and the Lords Supper are Sacraments. A Sacrament properly so called (as the name is attributed to Baptisme and the Lords Supper) is a Signe and Seale of the covenant of Grace, confirming unto us that Christ is ours, and we his; that in him we are justified, and through him shall be saved. Thus circumcision was a Sacrament in the time of the old Testament, *a token of the Covenant betwixt God and his people*, Gen. 17. 11. *a Seale of the righteousnesse of Faith*, Rom. 4. 11. So now is Baptisme, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Acts* 22. 16. And so the Lords Supper, 1 *Cor.* 11. 24, 25. But thus Ordination is not a Sacrament, not serving to signifie and seale the covenant of Grace, as Baptisme and the Lords Supper doe. * *Bellarmine* saith, that *Calvin* doth acknowledge Ordination to be a true Sacrament. But *Calvin* so grants it to be a Sacrament, as that he plainly shewes it to be no such Sacrament as Baptisme and the Lords Supper are. *As for the true office of a Presbyter* (or *Elder*, saith hee) *which is commended unto us by the mouth of Christ, I willingly account it a Sacrament. For there is a ceremony, first taken from the Scriptures, and then also such as* Paul *doth testifie not to be empty and superfluous, but a faithfull token and pledge of spirituall grace.* But presently after hee addes, *Christ hath promised the grace of the holy Ghost, not for the expiating of sins, but for the right governing of the Church.*

* Magis propriè deberet vocari Ordinatio quàm Ordo. *Durand l. 4. dist. 24. quæst. 1. Concil. Trid. Sess. 23. can. 3.*

† *Chemnit. in Ex. Calv. Instit. l. 4. c. 19. Sect. 28.*

* Calvinus agnoscit Ordinationem esse verum Sacramentum. *Bellar. de Sacram. Ord. lib. 1. cap. 1.*

Quantum ad verum Presbyterii munus, quod ore Christi nobis est commendatum, libenter eo loco habeo. Illic enim ceremonia est, primum ex Scripturis sumpta, deinde quam non esse inanem, nec supervacuam, sed fidele Spiritualis gratiæ symbolum Paulus testatur.——Spiritus S. gratiam (Christus) promisit, non ad peragendam peccatorum expiationem, sed ad gubernationem Ecclesiæ rite obeundam & sustinendam. *Calv. Instit. lib. 4. cap. 19. Sect. 28.*

Thus much also is yeelded by *Chemnitius* (whom yet *Bellarmine* would make to dissent from *Calvin*) *There is* *Bell. ubi Supra.*

Addita eſt promiſſio, Deum daturum gratiam, & dona, quibus ea, quæ ad Miniſterium pertinent, rectè, fideliter & utiliter præſtare & exequi poſſint, qui legitimè vocati ſunt. Joh. 20. Accipite ſpiritum S. *Chemnit. in Exam.*

(ſaith hee) *a promiſe added, that God will give grace, and gifts, whereby they who are lawfully called, may rightly, faithfully, and profitably performe and execute thoſe things, which belong unto the Miniſtery.* Joh.20. *Receive the holy Ghoſt.*

Et hæc ſeria oratio in ordinatione Miniſtrorum, quia nititur mandato & promiſſione Divinâ, non eſt irrita. Hoc vero eſt, quod Paulus dicit, Donum, quod eſt in te per impoſitionem manuum. *Chemnit. Ibid.* Si hoc modo intelligatur Ordinatio, de Miniſterio verbi & Sacramentorum, jamdudum Apologia Auguſtanæ Confeſſionis noſtrarum Eccleſiarum ſententiam declaravit, nos non gravatim Ordinem vocaturos Sacramentum. Et additur ibi, Nequè Impoſitionem manuum vocare Sacramentum gravabimur. Latè enim vocabulum Sacramenti patere ſuprà oſtendimus. *Ibid.*

And afterwards againe, *This ſerious prayer* (ſaith hee) *uſed in the Ordination of Miniſters, becauſe it builds upon Gods Precept and Promiſe, is not in vaine. And this is that which* Paul *ſaith, The gift, which is in thee by the laying on of hands.* Hee addes immediately, *If ordination be thus underſtood,* viz. *of the Miniſtery of the Word and Sacraments, the Apology of the confeſſion at Auſpurge hath long agoe declared what our Churches hold,* viz. *that we are not unwilling to call Order a Sacrament. And there it is added, neither will we ſtick to call Laying on of hands a Sacrament. For we have ſhewed before that the word Sacrament is of a large acception.*

Bellar. Loc. ſuprà citat.

Thus *Chemnitius*; whereby it may appeare, that neither doth he diſſent (as *Bellarmine* pretends he doth) from *Melanchthon*, the Author of the Apology of the confeſſion at Auſpurge, though I have not now liberty to conſult that Author. And thus alſo it appeares, that though Proteſtants deny Ordination to be a Sacrament of the ſame nature with Baptiſme, and the Supper of the Lord, and that juſtifying and ſaving grace is either conferred, or confirmed by it; yet they doe not deny but that it may be called a Sacrament, and that ſome interiour grace is conferred by it, and that becauſe of thoſe very words of the Apoſtle, which our Adverſaries ſtand upon, *the gift that is in thee by the laying on of hands.*

Facilè oſtendemus Ordinationem eſſe verum Sacramentum. Nam gratia, quæ illi promiſſa eſt, non eſt donum

But *Bellarmine* will eaſily prove (he ſaith) that Ordination is a true Sacrament. For (ſaith hee) *the grace that is promiſed unto it,*

is

is no common gift, as Prophecy, or the gift of Tongues, but juſtifying Grace. And this he proves by that Ioh. 20. *Receive yee the holy Ghoſt.* For that gift which may be in the ungodly, is never (hee ſaith) in the Scriptures called abſolutely the holy Ghoſt. He addes alſo that the gift ſpoken of 2 *Tim.*1. 6.*viz.* which was given to *Timothy* in his Ordination, was *the ſpirit of love, and of power, and of a ſound minde*; as it follows *verſ.*7.

aliquod gratis datum, ut prophetiæ, vel donum linguarum, ſed gratia juſtificans. Nam imprimis Joh. 20. cùm Dominus tribuit Apoſtolis poteſtatẽ remittendi peccata, quæ eſt pars quædam ſacerdotii, dixit, Accipite Spiritum S. non autem vocatur abſolutè Spiritus S. in Scripturis donum illud, quòd in impiis eſſe poteſt. Præterea 2*Tim.*1. ubi dixerat Apoſtolus gratiam *Timotheo* per manus impoſitionem datam, ſubjungit explicans quæ ſit illa gratia, Non enim dedit nobis (id eſt, nobis Epiſcopis) Spiritum timoris, ſed virtutis, & dilectionis, & ſobrietatis. *Bell. de Sacr. Ord. lib.* 1. *cap.* 2.

I anſwer, the places alledged doe not prove that juſtifying grace is promiſed, or by promiſe annexed unto Ordination.

For 1. It is not true, that the gift, which may be in the wicked, is never in the Scripture called the holy Ghoſt. For *Acts* 19. 6. it is ſaid of ſome, that *when* Paul *laid his hands upon them, the holy Ghoſt came on them:* yet by the holy Ghoſt there is meant ſuch a gift of the holy Ghoſt, as the wicked may receive, *viz.* the gift of Tongues, and Prophecy: for ſo immediately it followes, *and they ſpake with Tongues, and Propheſied.*

2. Neither doth it appeare, that the Apoſtle 2 *Tim.*1.7. doth explaine what he meant by *the gift* mentioned *verſ.*6. but having exhorted *Timothy* to ſtir up the gift that was in him by laying on of hands, hee addes as a motive to inforce the exhortation, *For God hath not given unto us the ſpirit of feare, but &c.* As if hee ſhould ſay, All true Chriſtians have received this Spirit of God, and more eſpecially all faithfull Miniſters: therefore ſtir up the gift that is in thee. &c. But the end of Ordination is not the juſtification of the perſon ordained, but the edification of others for whom hee is ordained. *Hee gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and ſome Evangeliſts, and ſome Paſtours and Teachers.* (Why? for what end?) *For the perfecting of the Saints, for the worke of the Miniſtery, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt.* Ephes. 4. 11,12.

So * *Durandus* an acute and learned Schoolemen, ſaith that *the Sacrament of*

Sacramentum Ordinis eſt ſpirituale medicamentum, non tamen illius, qui

Ordinem ſuſcipit, qui jam debet eſſe ſanus, ſed communitatis : quia per Ordinem efficitur homo diſpenſator ſacramentorum, *Durand. in Sem. lib. 4. diſt. 24. quæſt. 1. ad 1 m.*

Order is a ſpirituall medicine, yet not for him that is ordained, but for the people ; becauſe by Ordination a man is made a diſpenſer of the Sacraments &c.

For the Fathers here objected, there is onely one, *viz. Cyprian*, that I can punctually anſwer unto. Hee in the place cited hath nothing (that I finde) about Ordination. He ſpeakes indeed there of impoſition of hands for the receiving of the holy Ghoſt ; but the impoſition of hands there ſpoken of was not by way of Ordination, but by way of Confirmation, of which I have ſpoken before. For *Cyprian* there ſpeakes of laying hands upon all that had beene baptized by Heretikes, when they did returne to the Church, and not of laying hands upon ſuch as did receive Ordination.

Si habent (ſcil. hæretici Spiritum S.) cur illic Baptizatis, quando ad nos veniunt, manus imponitur ad accipiendum ſpiritum S. Cum jam utique illic acceptus ſit, ubi ſi fuit, dari potuit ? *Cyrian. Epiſt. 77. (Edit. Pamel.) ad Mag.*

The Marqueſſe himſelf in the point of Confirmation alledged *Cyprians* 71. Epiſtle, and this which he now alledgeth is in reſpect of the former part of it, of the ſame ſubject with that, and the reſt that follow, as *Pamelius* noteth in the Argument of the Epiſtle. The other Fathers are ſo cited, that there is no examining what they ſay, without more labour then the thing is worth, or reaſon doth require. *Auſtine* is cited in his queſtions upon Numbers, now there are 65 queſtions upon that book, but which of them is meant, is not expreſſed. In like manner are *Optatus* and *Tertullian* cited, without any mention made of the booke, wherein *Optatus* hath any thing to the purpoſe, whereas there are ſeven Bookes, which hee wrote ; or of the Chapter, in which *Tertullian de Præſcript.* ſpeaketh about Ordination, whereas that Booke of *Tertullian* hath 53. chapters. Neither doth *Bellarimne* in this controverſie about Ordination alledge either *Tertullian*, or *Optatus* at all ; nor *Cyprian*, but only in a worke, which himſelfe confeſſeth to be none of *Cyprians* : nor yet *Auſtine* in that place, which the Marqueſſe citeth. But how ever, it is granted, that the Fathers ſometimes call Ordination a Sacrament ; and ſo doe Proteſtants too, as hath beene ſhewed ; though they deny it to be a Sacrament of the ſame nature

Prior pars Epiſtolæ ejuſdem eſt argumenti cum præcedentibus. *Pamel in argum. Epiſt. 77. ad Magnum.*

Bell. de Sacram. Ord. lib. 1. c. 3.

nature with Baptiſme and the Lords Supper; and ſo much (as I have ſhewed) *Durandus* himſelfe doth acknowledge, making it to be a remedy provided for the ſpirituall welfare of others, and not of him that is ordained.

To proceede, *We hold* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *that the Prieſt, and other Religious perſons, who have vowed chaſtity to God, may not marry afterwards. You deny firſt, that it is lawfull to make any ſuch vowes: and ſecondly, that thoſe who have made any ſuch vows, are not bound to keepe them. We have Scripture for what we hold,* Deut. 23. 2. *When thou ſhalt vow a vow unto the Lord thy God, thou ſhalt not ſlack to pay it: for the Lord thy God will require it of thee. So* 1 Tim. 5. 11, 12. *But the younger widdowes refuſe, for when they have begun to wax wanton againſt the Lord, they will marry, having damnation, becauſe they have caſt off their firſt Faith. What can be meant hereby but the vow of chaſtity? or by their firſt faith, but ſome promiſe made to Chriſt in that behalfe? Otherwiſe Marriage could not be damnable. So all the ancient Fathers have expounded it.* S. *Aug. de bono viduit. cap.* 9. S. *Athanaſ. de Virginit.* S. *Epiphan. hær.* 48. S. *Hier. contra Jovin. l.* 1. *c.* 7. *Page* 71. *and* 72.

Anſw. One thing is here omitted by the Marqueſſe, which yet we muſt obſerve, *viz.* that they of the Church of *Rome* hold that Prieſts and Clergy-men (as they are called) ought not to Marry, and that they reſtraine them from Marriage, cauſing them to vow againſt it. Some of them hold this to be of divine inſtitution; *Bellarmine* though he likes not that, yet makes it to be an Apoſtolicall decree, which indeed amounts to as much. *Coſterus* the Jeſuite ſaith, *It is the moſt holy cuſtome of the Roman Church, agreeable to reaſon and the Scriptures, and received from our anceſtors, not to admit any to holy Orders, but him that is unmarried, or that with the conſent of his wife hath conſecrated his chaſtity unto God.*

Ego veriſſimum puto, decretum hoc, quo votum eſt annexum Ordinibus, non quidem propriè divinum eſſe, ſed tamen eſſe Apoſtolicum, &c. *Bell. de Cler. lib.* 1. *cap.* 18. Sanctiſſimus mos eſt Romanæ Eccleſiæ, rationique & Scripturis conſentaneus, atque à majoribus acceptus, quo neminem ad ſacros ordines admittat niſi cælibem, aut qui de uxoris conſenſu caſtitatem ſuam Deo conſecravit. *Coſter. Enchirid. de Cælib. Sacerdot.* Quinta propoſitio.

And the ſame Author affirmes, that *Although a Prieſt ſinne grievouſly if hee com-*

Sacerdos ſi fornicetur, aut domi concubinam foveat, tametſi gravi ſacrilegio mit

seſe obſtringat, gravius tamen peccat, ſi contrahat Matrimonium. *Ibid.*

Nona propoſitio. Sacerdotibus nullo modo permittenda ſunt Matrimonia. *Ibid.* Decima propoſitio.

mit Fornication, yet much more if hee Marry. And therefore hee concludes, that *Priests are by no meanes to be ſuffered to Marry*: Yet they may be ſuffered to commit fornication; for ſo the Gloſſe upon *Gratians* Decrees tells us, that *it is commonly held, that one ought not to be depoſed for ſimple fornication.* And marke the reaſon, *becauſe* (ſaith hee) *very few are found without that fault.* And ſo in another place, *They ſay that now none is to be depoſed for fornication, except he continue in it: and that becauſe our bodies are now more fraile then they were in times paſt.*

Communiter dicitur, quòd pro ſimplici fornicatione quis deponi non debet, cum pauciſſimi ſine illo vitio inveniantur. *Gloſſ. in diſt.* 81. *cap.* Maximianus. Dicunt hodiè pro fornicatione neminem deponendum, niſi in eâ perduret; & ideo quia hodiè fragiliora ſunt corpora noſtra quàm olim erant. *Gloſſ. in diſt.* 82. *cap.* Presbyter.

How well doth this agree with the Scripture, which ſaith that *Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge? Heb.* 13. 4. But ſaith *Bellarmine*, if Marriage be honorable in all, then in thoſe that are neare allied, and in thoſe that marry without the conſent of their Parents. I anſwer, Marriage may be, and is honorable in all; and yet not all kind of Marriage. It is lawfull for any to marry, yet not to marry with any; they that marry, muſt marry in the Lord. 1 *Cor.*7.39.

Si conjugia omnium ſunt honorabilia, etiam conjugia conſanguineorum in primo & ſecundo gradu erunt honorabilia; & conjugia adoleſcentium injuſſu parentum contracta, erunt honorabilia. *Bell. de Cler. lib.* 1. *cap.* 20.

In omnibus, *i.e.* in omnibus legitimè conjunctis, quicunque illi ſint, &c. Ita Theophylactus in hunc locum, & videtur magis literaliæ expoſitio. *Bellar. Ibid.*

Bellarmine himſelfe approves of *Theophylacts* Expoſition, *viz.* that *Marriage is honourable in all*, that is, in all that are lawfully joyned together, whoſoever they be: Now ſuch are all they, whom the Scripture doth not exclude, as it doth not the Clergy. *Gratian* himſelfe confeſſeth that it is but an Eccleſiaſticall Law, that forbids Prieſts to marry, and that before this prohibition their Marriage was every where

Cum ergo ex ſacerdotibus nati in ſummos Pontifices ſupra legantur eſſe promoti, non ſunt intelligendi de fornicatione, ſed de legitimis conjugiis nati: quia ſacerdotibus ante prohibitionem ubique licita erant: & in orientali Eccleſiâ uſquè hodiè licere probantur. *Diſt.* 56. *cap.* Cænomanenſem.

law-

lawfull, and ſo in his time was accounted in the Eaſterne Church. Yea hee ſaith, that many, whoſe Fathers were Prieſts, were promoted to be Popes; and that they were not to be thought borne of fornication, but of lawfull wedlock.

* *Caſſander* alſo acknowledgeth it to have beene but a conſtitution of the Church, and that though for a while it was expedient, yet afterwards it became a ſnare to many. He ſaith, that by the rigid and unſeaſonable exacting of this conſtitution, moſt grievous and abominable ſcandals are in the church. For that the cauſes, which moved them in former times to make that conſtitution, are not onely now ceaſed, but even turned quite contrary. That by this decree chaſtity and continency is ſo far from being confirmed, that thereby a window may ſeeme to be ſet open unto all kinde of luſt and lewdneſſe. And that it fares ſo now with ſome Prieſts, that the ſociety of their godly wives is not onely no hinderance, but it is a helpe and furtherance unto them in reſpect of their Eccleſiaſticall functions and imployments, as *Gregory Nazianzen* teſtifies of his parents.

* Non levibus de cauſis olim adducti fuerunt proceres Eccleſiæ, &c.—— Contra tamen fatendum eſt graviter à poſteris eſſe peccatum, qui hanc utilem pro tempore conſtitutionem multis in laqueum verterunt, &c. *Caſſand. Conſult. artic.* 23.

Quarè nimis rigidâ & intempeſtivâ hujus conſtitutionis exactione, graviſſima & abominanda in Eccleſiâ ſcandala exitiſſe videmus. Nam cauſæ illæ, quibus majores ad conſtitutionem hanc faciendam inductos eſſe diximus, non ſolùm hodiè ceſſarunt, ſed in contrarium ſunt converſæ. Nam primùm videmus hoc decreto uſque adeò caſtitatem & continentiam in Chriſto non confirmatam, ut per illud ad omne libidinis & flagitii genus feneſtra aperta eſſe videatur. Tum res in pleriſque ſacerdotibus ita comparatæ ſunt, ut conjugum piarum conſortio non modò ad functiones Eccleſiaſticas obeundas non impediantur, ſed etiam ad earum procurationem adjuventur ab eis: quemadmodum de patre ſuo Gregorio, & matre Nomiâ Gregorius Nazianzenus teſtatur. *Ibid.*

It remaines therefore (he ſaith) that henceforth this ſtatute be releaſed, and that according to the cuſtome of the ancient Church, and of the Eaſterne Churches unto this day, honeſt married men may be admitted to the Miniſtery of the Church, &c.

Reſtat primùm ut in poſterum ordinandis hoc ſtatutum relaxetur, & more veteris Eccleſiæ, & huc uſque Orientalium Eccleſiarum honeſti quoque mariti ad Eccleſiæ Miniſterium admittantur, &c.

There are weighty cauſes (hee ſaith) why this conſtitution ſhould be releaſed. And he cites *Panormitan* (a Cardinall, and great

Sunt igitur hujus conſtitutionis relaxandæ graves cauſæ, *&c.* Prudenter itaq; obſervavit & monuit Panormitanus,

Canoniſt)

Experientiâ docente contrariũ prorsus effectũ secutũ ex lege illâ continentiæ, cum hodiè non vivant spiritualiter, nec sint mundi, sed maculentur illicito coitu cum illorum gravissimo peccato, ubi cum propriâ uxore esset castitas. Unde debere Ecclesiam facere sicut bonus medicus, ut si medicina experientiâ docente magis obsit quàm prosit, eam tollat. *Ibid.*

Canonist) observing and admonishing, that experience shewes, that a quite contrary effect hath followed by that Law of continency, when as now they doe not live spiritually, nor are pure, but defiled with unlawfull copulation, to their most great sinne, whereas with their own wives they might live chastly. That the church therefore ought to doe, as a good Physician doth, who if he finde by experience, that the medicine doth more hurt then good, hee will prescribe it no longer.

Sunt autem causæ non leves, cur hodiè iis quoque, qui jam ordinati, non libidine, sed conscientiâ ducti, uxores duxerunt, & Ecclesiis utiles esse possunt, gratia hujus legis fieri debeat, &c. *Ibid.*

He goes further yet, and holds that not onely they, who were married before, may be ordained, and yet still keepe their conjugall society, but also that such as are allready ordained, may afterwards marry, and yet still continue their Ministery; though *Bellarmine* doth call this an errour much more grievous then the other, that not onely before Ordination, but even after Ordination it is lawfull to marry. But surely both Scripture and reason shewes this as lawfull as the other. And to returne to *Cassander*, hee testifies that marrying after Ordination is onely forbidden by humane statute; and that ancient examples doe shew that such Statutes are not precisely observed, but that when the necessity of the Church doth require it, they are dispensed with; and therefore so it ought to be now (hee saith) in this case, there being so great neede of it. And hee gives this reason why they that are ordained should be permitted to marry, because not onely no offence, but much benefit is to be expected by it. For that scarce one of a hundred is to be found, who doth wholly abstaine from women, and the people are so affected, that if a Priest be a fornicatour, or keepe a concubine,

Posterior error longè gravior est, non solum licere ante Ordinationem, sed etiam post Ordinationem, uxorem ducere. *Bell. de Cler. l. 1. cap. 19.*

Cum igitur hæc Matrimonii contractio post Ordinationem solo statuto prohibeatur, & exempla prisca extent, quæ testentur, hujusmodi statuta non tam anxiè observata fuisse, quin ob Ecclesiæ necessitatem aliquando relaxata fuerint, quis non concedat in extremâ hâc Ecclesiæ necessitate hoc idem hodiè fieri posse? ——Cur autem etiam in Ordinatis conjugium hodiè admitti possit, hæc ratio est, quòd ex hujusmodi conjugio non modò nulla offensio populi, sed magna etiam utilitas sit expectanda. Nam eò res jam rediit, ut vix centesimum invenias, qui ab omni commercio fœminarum abstineat, populus verò ita affectus est, ut sacerdotis fornicatoris vel concubinarii Ministerium vel prorsus condemnet, vel leviùs æstimet: maritum verò sacerdotem æquius ferat, ut cum populo quoque jam notum sit, honorabile esse in omnibus conjugium, adulteros autem, & fornicatores à Deo judicandos. *Ibid.*

they

they will either altogether condemne his Miniſtery, or make leſſe account of it, and will rather ſuffer a Prieſt that is married, it being now known even to the people, that *Marriage is honorable in all, and that Whore-mongers and Adulterers God will judge.* Wherefore (he ſaith) if ever it were time to change an ancient cuſtome, then certainly theſe times call for a change of this cuſtome, though it be ancient; when as all moſt good and religious Prieſts, acknowledging their weakeneſſe, and abhorring the filthineſſe of continuall Fornication, if they dare not doe it publikly, yet privately doe marry. Hee concludes, that the matter being brought almoſt to this, that a Prieſt muſt either be married, or have a concubine, every one muſt needs ſee, that though there be ſome inconvenience in this Marriage, yet it is to be choſen as a leſſe evill then the other.

Quarè ſi unquam tempus fuit antiquæ alicujus conſuetudinis immutandæ, certè hæc tempora hujus quamvis priſci moris immutationem aliquam efflagitare videntur, cum optimi quique, & religioſiſſimi ſacerdotes, infirmitatem ſuam agnoſcentes, & perpetuæ ſcortationis fæditatem exhorreſcentes, ſi publicè non audent, certè privatim conjugium ineunt, &c. Cum igitur hoc tempore, eò neceſſitatis res propemodum redacta ſit, ut aut conjugatus, aut concubinarius ſacerdos ſit admittendus, quis non videt, etiamſi quid in hoc conjugio ſit incommodi, minoris mali ratione potius eſſe eligendum? *Ibid.*

This was the judgement of *Caſſander*, a man of ſuch *note* and eminency in his time, that two Emperours, *viz. Ferdinand* the firſt, and *Maximilian* the ſecond, made choyce of him above all, as a man moſt meete to compoſe (if it might be) the differences betwixt Proteſtants and them of the Church of *Rome*.

Now whereas the Marqueſſe ſaith, that Proteſtants hold it unlawfull to make vowes of chaſtity; it is true, ſuch vowes of chaſtity as are made & maintained in the Church of *Rome*, which (as hath beene ſhewed by the teſtimony of *Caſſander*) prove ſnares, and occaſions of much unchaſtity, ſuch vowes (I ſay) Proteſtants doe indeed, and that moſt juſtly, hold unlawfull. None ought to vow that which is not in his power to performe; this is granted by all. Now it is not in every ones power to live unmarried, nor in the power of any, but to whom God is pleaſed to give it. *I would that all men were even as I my ſelfe,* (ſaith S. *Paul*) *but every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.* 1 *Cor.*7.7. And when the

Disciples said, *If the cause of the man be so with his wife, it is good not to marry:* our Saviour answered, *All men cannot receive this saying, but they to whom it is given. Mat.*19,10, 11. And againe *v.*12. having said, *There be Eunuches, which have made themselves Eunuches for the Kingdome of Heavens sake,* hee addes immediately, *He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.* *Maldonate* though hee would wrest the words another way, yet hee is forced to confesse that generally all do expound them thus, *All are not able to performe that which you speake of,* viz. *to be without a wife: because all have not the gift of continence, but onely they to whom it is given.* And though any see no necessity of marrying for the present, yet they know not what necessity there may be of it afterwards; and therefore to vow against it must needes be rash and dangerous. The Apostle bids, *to avoide Fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband,* 1 *Cor.*7.2. And is it lawfull then for any to vow never to marry, when as they know not but that thereby they shall expose themselves to the danger of Fornication? Even as they of the Church of *Rome* by their vowes doe, very few being free from Fornication, as I have shewed before by the confession of *Cassander*, and so of the Glosse upon *Gratian.* So also againe the Apostle speaking to the unmarried, saith, *If they cannot containe, let them marry; for it is better to marry then to burne.* 1 *Cor.* 7.9. But the vowes of chastity which the Romanists speake of, and contend for, presuppose that it is in any ones power to containe, and that there is no feare of such burning, as the Apostle speaks of. And whereas the Apostle would not have any under 60. years old to be chosen into the number of widdowes, though without any vow that wee reade of, 1 *Tim.*5.9. they of the Church of *Rome* allow as well young as old, of both Sexes, to vow to live unmarried.

Ita ferè omnes exponunt, ac si sensus esset, Non omnes, quod dicitis, præstare possunt, i.e. uxore carere; quia non omnes castitatis donum habent, sed quibus datum est. Quam interpretationem adduci non possum ut sequar, &c. *Maldon. ad loc.*

Estius himselfe upon the place saith, that *the Apostle requires that age, because in that there useth to be no danger of incontinency.*

Exigit hanc ætatem, quia in hâc ætate non solet esse periculum incontinentiæ. *Est. in* 1 *Tim.* 5. 9.

But

But hee addes preſently after, that *in the Apoſtles time they had no Monaſteries, or cloſe places, to keepe Women in, profeſſing continency, that ſo they might not freely wander abroad unto men.* I doe eaſily believe that there were indeed as then no ſuch places, nor yet any ſuch profeſſion neither, excepting ſuch Widdowes as the Apoſtle ſpeakes of, of whom more anon. But withall I ſuppoſe, that although wandering abroad may be an occaſion of defilement, as the example of *Dinah* ſheweth, yet walles and barres are not enough to preſerve chaſtity. And howſoever this is nothing to thoſe young Prieſts, that vow chaſtity, and yet are not ſhut up in that manner as their Nunnes are. That to be able to live a ſingle life, is no common gift, and conſequently that ſuch a life is not to be ſo commonly vowed, as now it is in the Church of *Rome*, diverſe of the Fathers doe informe us, though ſome of them went too farre in this kinde. *Hilary* ſpeaking of thoſe ſeverall kindes of Eunuches mentioned by our Saviour, *Mat.* 19. ſaith, that one is ſo by nature, *viz.* he that is borne ſo; another ſo by neceſſity, *viz.* hee that is made ſo; and the third ſo by will, *viz.* he that in hope of the Heavenly Kingdome hath determined to be ſo. And ſuch (hee ſaith) Chriſt would have us to be, if (marke that) *yet wee be able.* *Hierome*, a man of excellent learning, and of great piety, of all the ancient Fathers ſeemes moſt exorbitant, as concerning Virginity; ſurely in his writings againſt *Jovinian* hee expreſſeth himſelfe many times very harſhly; as thus, *If it be good not to touch a Woman; then it is evill to touch a Woman.* And againe, *What kinde of good, I pray you, is that, which hinders from praying?* So hee wreſts the words of the Apoſtle, as if he ſpake of ordinary Prayer, taking no notice of *faſting*, which the Apoſtle joynes with Prayer, 1 *Cor.* 7. 5. *The Apoſtle* (hee ſaith)

Tunc nondum extructa erant monaſteria, ſeu clauſtra, quibus coercerentur fœminæ continentiam profeſſæ, ne ad viros evagandi liberam poteſtatem haberent. *Eſt. Ibid.*

In uno poſuit naturam, in altero neceſſitatem, in tertio voluntatem. Naturam in eo, qui naſcitur; neceſſitatem in eo, qui ita factus eſt; voluntatem in illo, qui ſpe regni cœleſtis talis eſſe decreverit: cui nos ſimiles eſſe, ſi tamen poſſimus [*NB.*] admonuit. *Hilar. can. 19. in. Mat.*

* Si bonum eſt mulierem non tangere, malum eſt ergò tangere. *Hieron. contra Jovinian. lib.* 1. Oro te, quale iſtud bonum eſt, quod orare prohibet?——Jubet idem Apoſt. in alio loco, ut ſemper oremus. Si ſemper orandum eſt, nunquam ergò conjugio ſerviendum: quoniam quotieſcunque uxori debitum reddo, orare non poſſum. *Hieron. Ibid.*

elſewhere bids pray alwayes. If wee muſt pray alwayes, then wee muſt never doe the office of married perſons. For whenſoever I render due benevolence to my wife, I cannot pray. And in the ſame manner againe, *If wee muſt pray alwayes, then wee muſt alwayes be free from Marriage.* And citing thoſe words, *Woe to them that are with child, &c.* Mat. 24. 19. hee ſaith, *Not harlots and brothelhouſes are here condemned, of whoſe condemnation there is no doubt; but great bellies, and the crying of infants, and the fruits and effects of Marriages.* Thus alſo doth hee wreſt that ſpoken to our firſt Parents, *Bee fruitfull and multiply, and repleniſh the Earth.* Gen. 1. 28. *Marriage* (ſaith he) *doth repleniſh the Earth; but virginity doth repleniſh Paradiſe.* And he ſaith, that *Adam and Eve before they had ſinned, were virgins; but after the fall, and out of Paradiſe, they were Married.*

Si ſemper orandum eſt, ergo ſemper carendum Matrimonio. *Hier. Ibid.*

Væ prægnantibus, &c. Non hîc ſcorta, non lupanaria condemnantur, de quorum damnatione nulla dubitatio eſt: ſed uteri tumeſcentes, & infantum vagitus, & fructus atque opera nuptiarum. *Hier. ibid.* Conſideranda vis verbi, Replete terram: Nuptiæ terram replent, virginitas paradiſum. *Hieron. ibid.* De Adam & Evâ illud dicendum, quòd ante offenſam in paradiſo virgines fuerint: poſt peccatum autem, & extra Paradiſum protinus nuptiæ. *Hieron. ibid.*

Whereas nothing is more cleare in the Scripture then this, that God did joyne *Adam* and *Eve* together in Marriage before the fall, when they were in Paradiſe. Diverſe other ſuch like inconvenient paſſages hee hath, being carried away with the heate of contention. Yet even *Hierome* himſelfe in that very booke doth ſhew, that to live unmarried, is no ordinary matter, nor for every one to undertake. *This* (ſaith hee) *is a hard matter, and all doe not receive it, but they to whom it is given.* And againe, *Doe not feare leſt all become Virgins. Virginity is a hard thing; and therefore rare, becauſe hard.——If all could be virgins, the Lord would never ſay, Let him that is able to receive it, receive it. Neither would the Apoſtle be ſo fearfull in perſwading to virginity, ſaying, Now concerning virgins I have no Commandement of the Lord.* 1 Corinthians 7. 25.

Rectè quidem ſentitis, air, quòd non expediat homini ad cælorum regna tendenti, accipere uxorem: ſed difficilis res eſt, & non omnes capiunt verbum iſtud, verùm quibus datum eſt. *Hieron. ibid.*

Noli metuere, ne omnes virgines fiant, difficilis res eſt virginitas, & ideò rara, quia difficilis.—Si omnes virgines eſſe poſſent, nunquam & Dominus diceret, Qui poteſt capere, capiat: & Apoſtolus in ſuadendo non trepidaret, De virginibus autem præceptum Domini non habeo. *Hieron. Ibid.*

And

And in his commentary upon *Mat.* 19. *Christ* (saith hee) *inferres, Hee that is able to receive it, let him receive it; that every one may consider his strength, whether he be able to performe those things that are required of unmarried persons. For virginity of it self is pleasing, and alluring any one unto it; but mens strength is to be considered, that he that is able to receive it, may receive it.* It's true, *Hierome* saith there a little before, that hee that askes it, and labours for it, may receive it: but that must be understood, if God see it to be for his glory, and our good. So is that to be interpreted, *Aske, and it shall be given unto you. Mat.*7.7. And so also that, *What things soever yee desire, when yee pray, believe that yee receive them, and yee shall have them.* Mar. 11. 24. *The Lord will give grace, and glory*, as the Psalmist saith, *Psal.*84.11. And so consequently he will give all things that have a necessary connexion with grace and glory; such things may simply and absolutely be prayed for. But virginity is not of that nature, and therefore there can be no such assurance of obtaining it, although we pray for it.

Unde & infert, Qui potest capere, capiat: ut unusquisque consideret vires suas, utrum possit virginalia & pudicitiæ implere præcepta. Per se enim castitas blanda est, & quemlibet ad se alliciens: sed considerandæ sunt vires, ut qui potest capere, capiat. *Hieron. in Mat. 19.*

* *Gregory* also saith, that those words of our Saviour, *All doe not receive this saying*, shew that all are not capable of it; and that it is a thing hard to be obtained. And hee saith, that they that are unmarried, are to be admonished to get into the haven of Wedlock, if they endure the stormes of temptation so as to endanger their salvation. And that because it it written, *It is better to marry, then to burne.* Indeed hee addes immediately, that it is no sinne for them to marry, if yet they have not vowed that which is better, hee meanes, to live unmarried. But the question is how such could lawfully vow a single life, not knowing how unmeete they should be for it. And how obligatory such a vow is, wee shall consider anon.

* Veritas dicit, Non omnes capiunt verbum hoc. Quod eo innotuit summum esse, quo denegavit omnium: & dum prædicit quia difficilè capitur, audientibus innuit, captum cum quâ cautelâ teneatur. *Greg. Past. par.* 3. *admon.* 29. Admonendi sunt itaque, ut si tentationum procellas cum difficultate salutis tolerant, conjugii portum petant. Scriptum namque est, Melius est nubere, quàm uri. *Greg. Ibid. admonit.* 28. Sine culpâ quippe ad conjugium veniunt, si tamen necdum meliora voverunt. *Gregor. ibid.*

But thus alſo * *Bernard* complaining of the incontinency of the Clergy in his time, *I wiſh* (ſaith hee) *that they who are about to build a Tower, would ſit down, and count the coſt, leſt they prove unable to finiſh what they take in hand. I would that they who cannot containe, would be affraid raſhly to profeſſe perfection, and to give up their names to a ſingle life. For it is a coſtly Tower, and a great Word, which all are not able to receive.*

* Utinam magis turrim inchoaturi, ſedentes computarent ne fortè ſumptus non habeant ad perficiendum. Utinam qui continere non valent, perfectionem temerariè profiteri, aut cælibatui dare nomina verentur. Sumptuoſa ſiquidem turris eſt, & verbum grande, quod non omnes capere poſſunt. *Bern. de Converſ. ad Cler. cap.* 29.

Now for the other charge againſt Proteſtants, *viz.* that they hold, that ſuch as have made vowes to live unmarried, are not bound to keepe them; I anſwer, they hold indeed, that ſuch vowes being made, and tending to the prejudice of a mans ſoule by expoſing him to unavoidable danger of Fornication without uſing the remedy of Marriage, doe not binde, but are better broken then kept; even as it had beene better that *Herod* had broken his Oath then that he ſhould keepe it ſo as for his Oathes ſake to cauſe *John Baptiſt* to be beheaded. That of the Apoſtle holds good in reſpect of all, *To avoide Fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her owne husband.* 1 Cor. 7. 2. And that *v.* 9. *If they cannot containe, let them marry: for it is better to marry then to burne.* As therefore none ought ſimply and abſolutely to vow a ſingle life, ſo if they have vowed, they ought to repent of their raſhneſſe, and not to adde ſin to ſin by keeping their vow whatſoever follow upon it, but rather to marry then to burne with luſt, or to commit Fornication. The Gloſſe upon *Gratian* tells us, that *in every Vow, or Oath, ſuch generall conditions as theſe are underſtood, If God will, If I live, If I be able.* And *Gratian* himſelfe cites that of *Iſidore, In evill promiſes breake thy word; in a diſhoneſt vow change thy purpoſe; that which thou haſt unadviſedly vowed, doe not performe: it is a wicked promiſe, which is performed by wickedneſſe.*

Quantò tolerabilius tali fuiſſet perjurium Sacramento? *Amb. Offic. lib.* 3. *cap.* 12.

In omni voto vel Sacramento intelliguntur hujuſmodi generales conditiones, Si Deus voluerit, ſi vixero, ſi potero. *Gloſſ. in Cauſ.* 22. *Quæſt.* 2. *cap.* Beatus. In malis promiſſis reſcinde fidem: in turpi voto muta deretum: quod incautè voviſti, ne facias: impia eſt promiſſio, quæ ſcelere adimpletur. *Cauſ.* 22. *Quæſt.* 4. *cap.* In malis.

The

The ſame words are alſo cited by *Lombard* in his Sentences. To this purpoſe alſo *Aquinas*, *He that voweth* (ſaith hee) *doth after a ſort appoint a Law unto himſelfe, binding himſelfe unto ſomething, which in it ſelfe, and for moſt part is good. Yet it may happen that in ſome caſe it is either ſimply evill, or unprofitable, or hinders a greater good, which is againſt the nature of that which falls under a vow, as appeares by what hath beene ſaid before. And therefore it is neceſſary, that it be determined, that in ſuch a caſe a vow is not to be kept.* And ſo againe that Angelicall Doctour, as they ſtile him, *If by obſerving a vow great and manifeſt grievance enſue, a man ought not to keepe ſuch a vow.*

Lomb. lib. 3 diſt. 39. lit. i. Ille, qui vovet, quodammodo ſibi ſtatuit legem, obligans ſe ad aliquid, quod eſt ſecundum ſe, & in pluribus, bonum. Poteſt tamen contingere quòd in aliquo caſu ſit vel ſimpliciter malum, vel inutile, vel majoris boni impeditivum, quod eſt contra rationem ejus quod cadit ſub voto, ut ex prædictis patet. Et ideò neceſſe eſt, quòd determinetur in tali caſu votum non eſſe ſervandum. *Aquin. 2. 2 qu. 88. art. 10.* Si ex obſervatione talis voti magnum & manifeſtum gravamen ſentiret, & non eſſet facultas ad ſuperiorem recurrendi, non deberet homo tale votum ſervare. *Aquin. Ibid art. 2. ad 3 m.*

And * *Cyprian* writing of ſome that had profeſſed virginity, but were found to act contrary to their profeſſion, upon that occaſion gives this advice; *If they faithfully dedicate themſelves to Chriſt, let them continue honeſt and chaſt without any ſimulation; and ſo being ſtrong and ſtable, let them expect the reward of virginity. But if they will not, or cannot perſevere, it is better that they marry, then that they fall into the fire by their offences.*

* Quod ſi ex fide ſe Chriſto dicaverunt, pudicè & caſtè ſine ullâ fabulâ perſeverent; ita fortes & ſtabiles præmium virginitatis expectent. Si autem perſeverare nolunt, vel non poſſunt, melius eſt nubant, quàm in ignem delictis ſuis cadant. *Cyprian lib. 1. Epiſt. 11. vel Epiſt. 62. Edit. Pamel.*

† *Bellarmine* would have *Cyprian* here onely to admoniſh ſuch as have not vowed continency, rather to marry then to vow, if they have not a firme purpoſe to perſevere. But the words of *Cyprian* cannot without violence done unto them be otherwiſe underſtood then of thoſe Virgines, who did dedicate themſelves to Chriſt (as hee ſpeakes) by profeſſing continency.

† S. Cyprianus occaſione quarundam Virginum, quæ parum honeſtè ſe gerebant poſt votum continentiæ, monet alias, ut ſi non habent firmum propoſitum perſeverandi, non voveant, ſed nubant. *Bell. de Monach. lib. 2. cap. 34.* Loqui Cyprianum de iis Virginibus, quæ ſimplex (ut loquuntur) votum caſtitatis emiſerunt, non de velatis, quarum votum erat ſolenne, multa ſunt, &c. quæ convincere videantur. *Pamel. in Cypr.*

And

And ſo *Pamelius*, though hee make ſome uſe of that other Expoſition of *Cyprians* words, yet hee cannot but confeſſe that *Cyprian* ſpake of thoſe Virgins that vowed chaſtity; onely to mitigate the matter, he will have *Cyprian* to ſpeake of ſuch as onely made a ſimple vow, and not a ſolemne vow, as they diſtinguiſh it. But this is nothing; for the Scripture ſpeaking of the force of vowes, and requiring the performance of them, doth not uſe any ſuch diſtinction, nor give any intimation, that a ſimple vow more then that which is ſolemne may be broken, if it be juſt and lawfull. A vow hath its power of binding, not from the ſolemnity of it, but from its nature, *viz.* that it is a promiſe made to God; whether it be made ſolemnely or no, is not materiall; though its true, the more ſolemne that it is, the greater is the ſcandall in the breaking of it, but the ſin otherwiſe is the ſame, whether the vow be ſimple or ſolemne.

* Hoc votum (*nempe ſimplex*) habet efficaciam ex jure divino. *Aquin. 2.2 æ. quæſt. 189. art. 5.* Clemens dicit, quòd apud Deum non minùs obligat votum ſimplex, quàm votum ſolenne. *Bonav. in Sent. l. 4. diſt. 38. art. 2. qu. 1.*

* *Aquinas* ſpeaking of a ſimple vow, wherein no ſolemnity is uſed, ſaith, *This vow is efficacious by divine right.* And *Bonaventure* cites this ſaying of *Clemens*, *A ſimple vow doth binde in reſpect of God, no leſſe then a ſolemne vow.*

For the Scriptures alledged againſt us, that *Deut.* 23. 2. and ſo diverſe other places doe indeed require thoſe that make a vow, to performe it: but this cannot be underſtood of all vows whatſoever, but onely of lawfull vowes. For (as I have ſhewed) unlawfull vowes are not to be kept, but to be broken; and I have alſo ſhewed, that vowes of chaſtity, when they prove ſnares, and hinderances of chaſtity, are unlawfull, and ſo conſequently to be broken. There is more difficulty in the other place, *viz.* 1 *Tim.* 5. 11, 12. concerning which place alſo *Bellarmine* ſaith that nothing can there be meant by *firſt faith*, but the vow of continency; and that generally all ancient Writers did ſo underſtand it. But it doth not appeare by any thing in the words of the Apoſtle, that the widdowes, which hee ſpeaketh of, did make any ſuch vow; although by entring into the number of Widdowes, that were main-

Quo loco per primam fidem nihil aliud intelligi poteſt, niſi continentiæ votũ, ut omnes omninò veteres intellexerunt. *Bell. de Monach. lib. 2. cap. 24.*

maintained by the publike charge of the Church, and withall did ſervice to the Church, in attending the ſick, and the like, they did in a ſort profeſſe that they intended to live unmarried. What neede was there for ſuch Widdowes to vow continency, when as none of them were to be under 60. years old? 1 *Tim.* 5. 9. *Bellarmine* tells us, that the Apoſtle, ſaying, *Let not a Widdow be choſen under threeſcore years old*; and, *The yonger Widdowes refuſe*, that is, doe not chuſe them, doth not ſpeak of admiſſion unto the vow of continency, as if the yonger Widdowes might not be allowed to vow it; but hee ſpeakes either of election unto a certaine Office and Order of Deaconeſſe; or (which he thinkes more probable) of admiſſion into the number of thoſe Widdowes, which were maintained by the Church. But there is ſcarce any thing found in all this, ſave that it is true indeed, the Apoſtle doth not ſpeake of admiſſion to the vow of continency, there being no ſuch vowing in thoſe times: but it is evident, that the Apoſtle ſpeakes of admiſſion to a kinde of profeſſion of continency. For therefore he bids refuſe the yonger Widdowes, becauſe of their incontinency; *But the yonger Widdowes* (ſaith he) *refuſe: for When they have begun to wax wanton againſt Chriſt, they will marry.* 1 Tim. 5. 11. And *verſ.* 14. *I will therefore that the yonger Women marry, &c.* As if hee ſhould ſay, let not ſuch as are not likely to containe, be admitted among thoſe who are to live unmarried. Now theſe, it ſeemes, were ſuch as both had a kinde of Office in the Church, were Deaconeſſes, as *Phœbe* is ſtilled *Rom.* 16. 1. according to the Originall; and alſo had maintenance from the Church. The former appeares by 1 *Tim.* 5. 9, 10. The latter by 1 *Tim.* 5. 3. 4. 16. So that whereas *Bellarmine* would make ſeverall Expoſitions of theſe, they are to be joyned together to make one intire Expoſition. And in both theſe reſpects, *viz.* both in reſpect of the Office, and in reſpect of the maintenance, though more eſpecially (it ſeemes) in reſpect of the Office, theſe Widdowes were to remaine Widdowes, and not to marry againe; and that there might be little feare of their marrying

Dico Apoſtolum, cum ait, Vidua eligatur non minùs ſexaginta annorum: &, Adoleſcentiores viduas devita, *i.e.* non eas eligas, non loqui de admiſſione ad votum continentiæ, ſed vel de electione ad quandam præfecturam, & ordinem Diaconiſſæ.— vel, quod probabilius eſt, de admiſſione ad numerum earum viduarum, quæ ab Eccleſiâ alebantur. *Bellar. de Monach. l. 2. c. 24.*

the Apoſtle would have the younger Widdowes refuſed, and none admitted but ſuch as were threeſcore years old, or more. But the greateſt difficulty is, what is meant by the *firſt faith*, which the Apoſtle ſaith the younger Widdowes did caſt off, and therefore had damnation, 1 *Tim.*5. 12. It is true, the antient Writers for moſt part expound it of a promiſe, or covenant of a ſingle life; but all that goe this way, doe not ſpeake of any vow that was made: neither *Chryſoſtome*, nor *Theophylact* doth upon the place. Yea, ſome of the antients ſhew that they underſtood the Apoſtle as ſpeaking of the Chriſtian faith, or *the common faith*, as it is called *Tit.*1.4. ſure I am, ſome of them make uſe of the Apoſtles words, and apply them that way. *Hierome* ſpeaking of Heretikes ſaith that *they have caſt off* (or *made voide*) *their firſt faith*. So * *Vincentius Lirinenſis* in his Booke againſt Hereſies, ſaith, *It is well knowne, how grievouſly the bleſſed Apoſtle* Paul *doth inveigh againſt thoſe, who with wonderfull lightneſſe are quickly removed from him that called them to the grace of Chriſt, unto another Goſpell, which is not another: who heape up to themſelves teachers after their own luſts, turning away their Eares from the truth, being turned unto fables; having damnation, becauſe they have made void their firſt faith.*

Fidem pactum dicit. *Chryſoſt.*

Fidem conventa dicit, & pactiones. *Theophyl.*

Licet non ſint digni fide, qui fidem primam irritam fecerunt, Marcionem loquor, & Baſilidem, & omnes hæreticos, &c. *Hieron. præfat. in Epiſt. ad Tit.*

* Scitum etenim cunctis eſt, quàm graviter, &c. invehatur in quoſdam B. Apoſt. Paulus, qui mirâ levitate nimium citò tranſlati fuerant ab eo, qui eos vocaverat in gratiam Chriſti, in aliud Evangelium, quod non eſt aliud: qui coacervarunt ſibi Magiſtros ad ſua deſideria, à veritate quidem auditum avertentes, converſi verò ad fabulas; habentes damnationem, quod primam fidem irritam feciſſent. *Vincent. Lirin. adverſ. Hæreſ.*

Quòd debeat fides hoc loco pro pacto ac voto accipi, non pro fide Chriſtianâ, quâ Deo credimus, colligitur ex illo verbo adjuncto (irritam fecerunt.) Nam fides, quâ Deo credimus, non rectè dicitur irritari, ſed amitti, vel corrumpi: pacta autem & vota propriiſſimè irritari dicuntur. *Bell. ubi ſuprà.*

Bellarmine therefore was more curious and criticall, if not rather more captious and contentious, then tender and reſpective of the credit of theſe antient Doctours, when he ſaid, that *faith* here muſt be taken for covenant and vow (yet there may be a covenant where there is no vow) and cannot be taken for Chriſtian faith; becauſe Chriſtian faith is not rightly ſaid to be made voide, but to be loſt, or corrupted: but covenants and vowes

vowes are moſt properly ſaid to be made voide. *Hierom* and *Vincentius* underſtood the propriety of words as well as *Bellarmine*, who ſhewes himſelfe * barbarous in theſe very words, wherein he ſo playes the critick; yet they (wee ſee) thought it not improper to ſay, that Heretikes make voide the faith, which is neceſſarily meant of the Chriſtian faith, and not of any vow or covenant. Nether doe I ſee but that wee may as properly ſay, that faith, being meant of the Chriſtian faith, is made voide, as that the Law is made voide, *Heb.* 10. 28. or that the grace of God is made voide, *Gal.* 2. 21. wee reade it in the former place *deſpiſed*, in the other place *fruſtrate*, but the Greeke word in both places is the ſame with that in the Epiſtle to *Timothy*. And as the words will well beare this ſenſe, *viz.* that it is the Chriſtian faith, which the Apoſtle ſaith, ſome did caſt off, or make void, ſo this ſenſe is agreeable to the Apoſtles expreſſions in other places of this Epiſtle. *Holding faith and a good conſcience, which ſome having put away, concerning faith have made ſhipwrack.* 1 Tim. 1. 19. *If they continue in faith.* 1 Tim. 2. 15. *Some ſhall depart from the faith,* 1 Tim. 4. 1. And in the very ſame Chapter, in which are the words controverted, *If any provide not for his own, &c. hee hath denied the faith, &c.* * 1 Tim. 5. 8. So alſo in the other Epiſtle to Timothy; *who concerning the truth have erred, &c. and overthrow the faith of ſome.* 2 Tim. 2. 18. *Men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.* 2 Tim. 3. 8. *I have kept the faith.* 2 Tim. 4. 7. In all theſe places *faith* is underſtood of Chriſtian faith: and therefore probably ſo is it in that other place, about which wee diſpute. So that this may well be the meaning of the place, that they, of whom the Apoſtle ſpeakes, being cenſured of the Church for their lightneſſe and laſciviouſneſſe, and not able to beare the diſgrace, did quite caſt off the Chriſtian faith, which before they profeſſed, and ſo expoſed themſelves unto damnation. I ſee nothing uncouth, nor incongruous in this Expoſition; and it doth well agree with that which the Apoſtle ſaith a little after, *For ſome are allready turned after Satan.* 1 Tim. 5. 15. which words ſeeme to import a plaine and open renouncing of Chriſt; as on the other ſide to come after CHRIST, is as much as to profeſſe his Name. *Mat.* 16. 24. *Luke* 9. 23.

* *Irritari* twice put for *irrita fieri.*

1 Tim. 5. 12. ἠθέτησαν. Heb. 10. 28. ἀθετήσας. Gal. 2. 21. ἀθετῶ.

* See alſo 1 Tim. 6. 10. & 21.

Object. But may ſome ſay, the Apoſtle reproves theſe of whom hee ſpeakes, for that they begin to wax wanton againſt Chriſt, and will marry, which argues, that they had vowed, or profeſſed continency; for elſe why might they not marry? *The wife is bound by the Law ſo long as her husband liveth: but if her husband be dead, ſhe is at liberty to be married to whom ſhe will, only in the Lord.* 1 Cor. 7. 39.

Anſ. I grant, that thoſe Widdowes, though they did not vow, yet by the very courſe of life which they entred upon, did profeſſe continency, marriage and that courſe being inconſiſtent. And juſtly might they be reproved both for their raſhneſſe in taking upon them that profeſſion, and for their lightneſſe in falling off from it when there was no juſt cauſe for it. The Apoſtle doth not ſimply condemne them for having a minde to marry, but becauſe out of wantonneſſe they would needs marry. And it might be called wantonneſſe againſt Chriſt, becauſe they had addicted themſelves to the ſervice of Chriſt in his Church and Members, which ſervice they did deſert by their wantonneſſe. And in this ſenſe, by *their firſt faith* may be meant the promiſe, either formall, or virtuall, which thoſe Widdowes did make unto the church, that they would remaine Widdowes, and not marry; which promiſe they breaking meerely out of wantonneſſe, well might the Apoſtle ſay that they had damnation for it. But all this proves not that it is ſinfull and damnable for any that have vowed continency, afterwards to marry.

Bell. de Mon. lib. 2. cap 30. Though *Bellarmine* will by no meanes endure that thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *I will therefore that the younger Widdowes marry, &c.* 1 Tim. 5. 14. be underſtood of ſuch as had profeſſed continency, as if the Apoſtle would have ſuch to marry, if they could not containe. So alſo *Eſtius* upon the place, who ſaith, that otherwiſe the Apoſtle ſhould caſt them headlong into damnation. *For if they have damnation, who have a will to marry; how much more they that doe marry?* But though I thinke, that the Apoſtles direct meaning was, that the younger Widdowes ſhould not be admitted into the number of thoſe who were by their place and calling to profeſſe continency, into which number

Non hoc dicit Apoſt. de junioribus illis viduis, quæ jam voverant ſe non amplius nupturas. Neque n. eas vult præcipitare in damnationem. Nam ſi damnationem habebant nubere volentes, quanto magis nubentes? *Eſt. ad 1. Tim. 5. 14.*

ber hee would have none admitted under 60. years old; yet *Eſtius* his reaſon is not valid. For the *Apoſtle* doth not ſay, that the younger Widdowes being admitted into that number, and afterwards willing to marry, or actually marrying, therefore had damnation; but becauſe they would marry out of wantonneſſe, and ſo out of wantonneſſe make voide their firſt faith, *viz.* their promiſe of continency made to the Church, if not their Chriſtian Faith, which before they profeſſed. Notwithſtanding which ſentence, it followes not, but that if, not through wantonneſſe, but through weakneſſe, they were forced to marry, the Apoſtle would have them to doe it, rather then to doe worſe, *viz.* burne with luſt, and commit Fornication. For whereas the ſame authour ſaith, *It is not better for ſuch as have vowed contineney, to marry, then to burne*, this is nothing elſe but a flat contradicting of the Apoſtle; or at leaſt a contradicting of that Rule, *We muſt not diſtinguiſh, where the Law doth not diſtinguiſh.* And we finde in their own Canons, that if Widdows did profeſſe continency, yet *a ſnare was not to be caſt upon them*, to wit, as the Gloſſe doth expound it, *by ſeparating them from their Husbands, if they did marry, or by forbidding them preciſely to marry.* Another Canon alſo, which they have, injoynes no more but this, that *if ſuch as profeſſe Virginity, did afterwards marry, they ſhould be ranked amongſt thoſe that did marry the ſecond time, viz.* after the death of the firſt yoke-fellow: which marriage the Scripture doth clearly allow, *Rom* 7. 39. neither did any Orthodox Writer ever condemne it. Their *Canon-Law* indeed debarres thoſe that are twice married, from being Prieſts, (grounding upon the *Apoſtle*, 1 Tim. 3. 2. and *Titus* 1. 6. which places their owne Cardinall *Cajetan* doth yet interpret otherwiſe) but yet grant that ſuch doe not ſinne. They grant alſo that

Qui continentiæ voto ſunt alligati, iis non eſt melius nubere, quàm uri. *Eſt ad* 1. *Cor.* 7. 9.

Non eſt diſtinguendum, ubi lex non diſtinguit.

Nos autem nullum talibus laqueum debemus injicere. *Pellag. apud Grat. Cauſ.* 27. *quæſt.* 1. *cap. De viduis.*

Laqueum; eos ſeparando, vel eos præciſe prohibendo ne contrahant. *Gloſ. ibid.*

Quotquot Virginitatem pollicitam prævaricatæ ſunt, profeſſione contemptâ, inter bigamos, i. e. qui ad ſecundas nuptias tranſierunt, haberi debebunt. *Cauſ.* 27. *quæſt.* 1. *cap. Quotquot.*

7. 2, 3. and 1 *Cor.*

Qui iteraverit conjugium, culpam quidem non habet coinquinati, ſed prærogativâ exuitur ſacerdotis. *Diſt.* 26. *cap. Qui ſine.*

Cajet. in 1 *Tim.* 3.

that if any marry after a ſimple vow of continency, the marriage doth ſtand good, and is not to be diſſolved. For this they have a Canon out of *Auſtine*, which runs thus; *Some ſay, that they that marry after a vow, are adulterers: but I ſay unto you, that they that divide ſuch, doe ſinne grievouſly.* And another out of *Theodorus*, thus; *If a man having a ſimple vow of virginity, joyne himſelfe to a Wife, let him not afterwards put her away; but let him doe penance three yeares.*

Quidam nubentes poſt votum aſſerunt adulteros eſſe: ego autem dico vobis, quòd graviter peccant, qui tales dividunt. *Diſt.* 27. *cap.* Quidam. Si vir ſimplex Virginitatis votum habens, adjungitur uxori, poſteà non dimittat uxorem, ſed tribus annis pæniteat. *Ibid.* Si vir.

Reſpondeo, nuſquam legi apud veteres, quod nuptiæ viduarum, quæ continentiam voverunt, irritæ fuerint. Neque enim votum earum erat ſolenne, &c. *Eſtius in* 1 *Tim.* 5. 12.

And ſo *Eſtius* confeſſeth, that we never reade in antient writers, that if Widdowes, who vowed continency, did marry, their marriage was voide, and of none effect. For (ſaith hee) *their vow was not ſolemne.* But I have ſhewed before, that the diſtinction of *ſimple* and *ſolemne* vow hath no ground in Scripture; and that in reſpect of God, a ſimple vow doth binde as much as a ſolemne. And beſides, if (as they alledge, and cite ſome of the antients alſo for it) one having vowed continency (whether ſolemnely, or ſimply) is married unto Chriſt, and therefore may much leſſe marry another, then one that is allready married to a mortall man, then ſurely the marriage of ſuch ſhould much rather be judged adultery, and be diſſolved, then the marriage of thoſe, who marry againe, when they are already married. Yet *Bellarmine* goes further, and acknowledgeth that many prime Writers of the Church of *Rome*, as *Scotus*, *Paludanus*, and *Cajetane*, and generally, as *Panormitan* doth relate, all the Canoniſts affirme, that onely by Eccleſiaſticall right marriage made after a ſolemne vow is of no force. And this opinion hee granteth to be probable. So then, by their own confeſſions it may appeare, that there is no Law of God againſt it, but that ſuch as have vowed continency, ſhould marry if they be not able to performe what they have vowed. And this may ſuffice for this point.

Eſtius in 1 *Tim.* 5. 11. *Bell. de Monach. l.* 2. *c.* 24.

At Scotus & Paludanus in 4. diſt. 38. & Cajetanus in 2 2. qu. 88. art. 7. & omnis ſchola Jureconſultorum, ut refert Panormitan: in c. *Rurſus.* Qui clerici, vel voventes, aſſerunt ſolo jure Eccleſiaſtico matrimonium irritum, quod poſt votum ſolenne contrahitur.——utraque ſententia probabilis eſt. *Bell. de Mon. l.* 2. *c.* 34.

The

The Marqueſſe goes on thus, *We ſay, Chriſt deſcended into Hell, and delivered thence the ſoules of the Fathers: yee deny it. Wee have Scripture for it, viz.* Epheſ. 4.8. *When he aſcended up on high, he led captivity captive, &c. Deſcending firſt into the lower part of the Earth. This lower part of the Earth could not be a grave; for that was the upper part: nor could it have beene the place of the damned; for the Devils would have beene brought againe into Heaven. More clearly Acts* 2.27. *Thou wilt not leave my ſoule in Hell, neither wilt thou ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption. There is Hell for his ſoule for a time, and the grave for his body for a while. Plainer yet,* 1 Pet. 3.18,19. *Being put to death in the fleſh, but quickned by the ſpirit; by which alſo hee went, and preached unto the ſpirits in priſon. This priſon cannot be Heaven; nor Hell, as it is the place of the damned: nor the grave, as it is the place of reſt. Therefore it muſt be* (as S. *Aug. Epiſt.* 99. *ad Evod. ſaith*) *ſome third place: which third place the Fathers have called* Limbus Patrum. *Alſo* Zach. 9.11. *As for thee alſo, by the blood of thy Covenant, I have ſent forth thy priſoners out of the pit, wherein is* * *no water. By this pit could not be meant the place of the damned; for they have no ſhare in the Covenant; neither are they Chriſts priſoners, but the Devils: neither could this pit be the grave, becauſe Chriſts grave was a new pit, where never any was laid before. The Fathers affirm as much,* S. *Hieron. in* 4. *ad Epheſ.* S. *Greg. l.* 13. *Moral. c.* 20. S. *Aug. in Pſal.* 37.1. Page 72.

* No is left out in the Marqueſſe his writing, but not I ſuppoſe by his fault.

Anſw. That Chriſt did deſcend into Hell in that ſenſe, as they of the Church of *Some* doe hold, *viz.* into a Region of Hell called *Limbus Patrum*, to deliver the faithfull thence, that lived and died under the old Teſtament, this Proteſtants deny; and they have juſt cauſe to deny it. For the Scripture doth not ſhew us any ſuch Hell as this, which they ſpeake of, much leſſe that CHRIST did deſcend into it. 1. The faithfull that were before Chriſt, did enjoy the benefit of him, as well as they that are ſince his comming. *We believe* (ſaid *Peter*) *that through the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, wee ſhall be ſaved even as they.* Acts 15.11. Therefore they were ſaved by Chriſt, as well as we now are ſaved by him: and conſequently the faithfull then through *Chriſt* did goe to Heaven, as well as now they doe. 2. It is ſaid of the faithfull of the old Teſtament, that *they confeſſed that they were*

Were ſtrangers and pilgrims upon the Earth. Heb. 11. 13. and that *they did ſeeke a country*, v. 14. not an earthly country, but *a better country, that is an Heavenly*; and that *God did prepare for them a City*, v. 16. 3. *Abrahams boſome* (as the place is called, where the ſoules of the Saints of the old Teſtament were) is ſo deſcribed in the Scripture, as that it could be no ſuch place as they call *Limbus Patrum*. For 1. The ſoule of *Lazarus* was carried thither by Angels; and therefore it ſhould rather be Heaven then Hell. 2. It was a place of comfort, *Luke* 16. 25. But * *Auſtine* could not finde (hee ſaith) with all his ſearching, where the Scripture doth make Hell to be any place of comfort; and hee thought this a good argument why *Abrahams boſome* could not be Hell. 3. There was *a great gulfe fixed* betwixt the place where *Lazarus* was, *viz. Abrahams boſome*, and the place where the rich man was in torment, *Luke* 16. 26. And hence alſo † *Auſtine* inferreth, that *Abrahams boſome* is no part, or member as it were of Hell. This (hee ſaith) doth in his opinion ſufficiently appeare by thoſe words, *betwixt us and you there is a great gulfe fixed.* Luke 16. 26. * *Bellarmine* therefore doth abuſe his Reader, when he ſaith, that *Auſtine here* may ſeeme to doubt whether *Abrahams boſome*, where the ſoules of the Fathers in times paſt were, was in Hell, or ſome where elſe.

* Nondum inveni, & adhuc quæro, nec mihi accurrit inferos alicubi in bono poſuiſſe Scripturam duntaxat Canonicam: non autem in bono accipiendum ſinum Abrahæ, & illâ requiẽ, quò ab Angelis pius pauper ablatus eſt, neſcio utrum quiſquam poſſit audire, *Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 12. c. 33.* Ita etiam. *Epiſt 99.* † In his ipſis tanti magiſtri verbis, ubi ait dixiſſe Abraam, Inter vos & nos chaos magnum firmatum eſt, ſatis, ut opinor, appareat, non eſſe quandam partem, & quaſi membrum inferorum tantæ fælicitatis ſinum. *Auguſt. Epiſt. 99.* * Auguſtinus etſi in Epiſt. 99. ambigere videatur, an ſinus Abraham, ubi erant animæ Patrum olim, in inferno eſſet, an alibi; tamen in lib. 20. de Civ. Dei c. 15. affirmat in inferno fuiſſe. *Bell. de Chriſti animâ. l. 4. c. 11.*

Auguſtinus Epiſt 99. diſputando colligit, ſinum Abrahæ non fuiſſe aliquam inferni partem. *Janſen. Concord. cap. 97.*

Et Auguſtinus lib. 9. Confeſſ. loquens de Nebridio dicit, Quicquid illud eſt, quod ſinus Abrahæ vocatur, ibi Nebridius meus vivit. *Janſen. Ibid.*

Janſenius is much more ingenuous, who confeſſeth that *Auſtine* by diſputing the point did gather, that *Abrahams boſome* was no part of Hell. And hee obſerves alſo that *Auſtine* makes the faithfull that died ſince *Chriſt*, to be in *Abrahams boſome*, whereas their *Limbus Patrum* they hold to have beene onely for the faithfull that were before *Chriſt*. Neither is it true, which *Bellarmine* ſaith, that *Auſtine*

Auſtine elſewhere affirmeth *Abrahams boſome* to have beene in Hell. For *Auſtine* in the place which *Bellarmine* citeth, onely ſaith, *If it ſeeme not abſurdly to be believed*; ſo that where *Auſtine* ſpeakes doubtfully, there *Bellarmine* makes him to determine; and where hee doth determine, there *Bellarmine* makes him to ſpeake doubtfully. 4. That argument, which *Bellarmine* uſeth to prove that now in the time of the new Teſtament the ſoules of the godly goe to Heaven, is alſo of force in reſpect of thoſe in the time of the old Teſtament. *God (* ſaith hee *) is not more prone to puniſh, then he is to reward. Therefore ſeeing the wicked are now in torments, it doth truly ſeeme equall and reaſonable, that the righteous doe alſo now receive their rewards.* And that the wicked now when they die, goe preſently to the place of torments, he proves by that *Luke* 16. where it is ſaid, that the rich man immediately after his death was in torments. Now by this reaſon the godly alſo that were before Chriſt, went to Heaven when they died, for that *Luke* 16. ſhewes, that before Chriſt, the wicked, when they died, went to the place of torment. 5. Chriſt ſaid unto the believing Theife, *This day ſhalt thou be with mee in Paradiſe.* Now *Bellarmine* approves of the Expoſition of *Theophylact*, *Ambroſe*, *Bede*, and others, who by *Paradiſe* here underſtand the Kingdome of Heaven. And ſo is the word *Paradiſe* taken (as *Bellarmine* alſo obſerves) 2 *Cor.* 12. 4. compared with *v.* 2. By this then it appeares, that the ſoule of *Chriſt*, when he died, went to Heaven, and conſequently to no ſuch *Limbus*, or part of Hell, as they talke of.

Si non abſurdè credi videtur, &c. *Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib.* 20. *cap.* 15.

Deus non eſt pronior ad puniendum, quàm ad remunerandum. Quarè cum impii jam nunc in tormentis ſint, æquum certè videtur, ut etiam juſti præmia ſua percipiant. *Bell. de Sanct. beat. l.* 1. *c.* 6.

Eſſe autem nunc impios in tormentis Evangelium teſtatur, Luc. 16. *Bell. Ibid.*

Vera ergo expoſitio eſt Theophylacti, Ambroſii, Bedæ & aliorum, qui per paradiſum intelligunt regnum cælorum. *Bell. de Sanct. beatitud. lib.* 1. *cap.* 3.

For the places of Scripture, which the Marqueſſe alledgeth, firſt that *Epheſ.* 4. 8, 9. doth not ſpeake of *Limbus Patrum.*

Cajetane upon the place, by *the lower parts of the Earth* underſtands the Earth it ſelfe, which is the lower part of the World.

Ac ſi apertiùs dixiſſet, quia deſcendit primùm ad inferiorem partem mundi, terram. *Caje. in Epheſ.* 4. 9.

And *Estius* notes, that besides *Cajetane*, other Romanists also as *Catharinus*, and *Arias* doe embrace this Exposition, and that *Aquinas* doth not reject it. And (as *Estius* also observes) the argument which the Apostle useth in those words, *This that hee ascended, What is it, but that he descended first into the lower parts of the Earth*, this argument, I say, doth much favour that Exposition. *This consequence is more easie* (saith *Estius*) *if you understand the Earth absolutely, then if any thing else: because Christs ascension from Earth to Heaven is here understood.*

Alii terram ipsam intelligunt; q d. in infimam mundi partem, quæ est terra. Sensum hunc S. Thom. non reiicit; Cajetan: amplectitur, & Catharin: & Arias: Pro his facere videtur consequentia, quam Apost. indicat, hujusmodi: Christus ascendit in cælum: ergò priùs descendit, &c. Quæ consequentia promptior est, si terram absolutè intelligas, quàm si quid aliud. Nam ascensio Christi è terrâ in cælum intelligitur. *Est. ad loc.*

And (say I) before Christ could ascend from Earth to Heaven, as hee did, it was necessary that hee should descend from Heaven to Earth, *viz.* by his Incarnation: but there was no necessity of his descending to *Limbus Patrum* before his ascending into Heaven; for hee might well enough ascend thither, though he did never descend into the other place, suppose such a place to have beene. *Estius* also notes that some expound there *the lower parts of the Earth* to be the grave, which is called *the heart of the Earth*, Mat. 12. 40. And if by the Lower parts of the Earth, some certaine parts of it, which are lower then some other parts, are to be understood, then most meete it is to understand the Grave, into which CHRIST descended. It is strange that the Marquesse saith, that *the Grave was the upper part*, and yet a little after saith, *Christs Grave was a new pit.* If it were a pit, then was it not the upper part of the Earth, but the lower part of it. *Ezech.* 32. 18. by *the neither parts of the Earth* are meant Graves, as appeares *vers.* 23. So in the place objected, *Christs* Grave may be called *the lower parts of the Earth*, that is, one of the lower parts (as *Judg.* 12.7. its said that *Jephtah* was buried *in the Cities of Gilead*, that is, in one of the cities) in opposition to the surface, or uppermost part of the Earth, on which we live.

Alii de sepulchro exponunt, juxta illud quod Dominus de se dicit Mat. 12. Sicut fuit Jonas, &c sic erit filius hominis in corde terræ, &c. *Est. Ibid.*

Finally,

Finally, *Eſtius* confeſſeth, that it is not certaine, that there by *the lower parts of the Earth*, is meant a certaine Region of Hell, although hee thinke that Expoſition more probable then the other. But that it hath any ſuch probability in it, his reaſons doe not evince. For 1. It is not ſo, as he ſaith, that the lower parts of the Earth doe moſt fitly ſignifie Hell, either as they take it here for *Limbus Patrum*, or as uſually it is taken for the place of torment. I have ſhewed out of *Ezech.* 32. 18. how the phraſe is otherwiſe uſed, *viz.* for the Grave. Neither doth it appeare that the words are taken in any other ſenſe, *Pſal.*63. 9. which place *Eſtius* alledgeth; *they ſhall goe into the lower parts of the Earth*, that is, they ſhall be taken away out of the Land of the living, as it followes immediately, *They ſhall fall by the Sword, &c.* 2. *Chriſts* deſcent into Hell in that ſenſe, which the Romaniſts maintaine, did not (as *Eſtius* pretends) goe a little before his aſcenſion into Heaven. Neither (which hee urgeth alſo) doe thoſe words, prove it, *that hee might fill* (or *fulfill*) *all things*. For thoſe words (as *Eſtius* himſelfe doth ſhew) are diverſely expounded. Some underſtand it of *Chriſts* fulfilling all things, that were written of him. Others expound it thus, that hee might fill all kinds of men with ſpirituall gifts. And this ſenſe doth well agree with that *v.*8. *Hee gave gifts unto men*: and with that *v.*11. *And he gave ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, &c.*

Hieron: & plerique infernum intelligunt, &c. Qui ſenſus etſi non certus, probabilitatem tamen præ cæteris habet. 1. Ex ipſâ phraſi, quâ utitur Apoſt. nam inferiores partes, i.e. infima terræ, nihil aptius quàm quod nos infernum dicimus, ſignificant. Ut in Pſal. 62. Introibunt in inferiora terræ. 2. Quia deſcenſus Chriſti ad inferos Paulò antè præceſſerat ipſius in cælos aſcenſionem. —— Denique ex eo, quod hîc ſequitur, ut impleret omnia. *Eſt. Ibid.*

Ut impleret omnia, de ſe ſcripta, ut quidam exponunt. Alii omnia hominum genera ſpiritualibus donis implenda ſignificari putant. *Eſt. ad Epheſ.* 4. 10.

The other place which is next cited, *viz. Acts* 2.27. is indeed more cleare to ſhew that *Chriſts* Soule was for a while left in Hell, but not in that Hell which our adverſaries ſpeake of, *viz. Limbus Patrum*. For 1. Some by *Hell* there underſtand the Hell of the damned. Thus *Auſtine* and *Fulgentius* expound it, as *Bellarmine* obſerves, who alſo cites for this Expoſition *Cyrill*, *Ambroſe*, *Euſebius Emiſſenus*, and *Gregory Nyſſen.*

Aug. Epiſt. 99. dicit Chriſtum deſcendiſſe ad loca inferni, ubi erant dolores, & tormenta. Et Fulgentius, &c. *Bell. de Chriſti anima lib.* 4. *cap.* 16.

Aquinas 3. p. q. 52. art. 2. docet Christum per realem presentiam solùm descendisse ad Limbum Patrum, &c. At probabile est profectò Christi animam ad omnia loca inferni descendisse. *Bell. Ibid.*

And therefore contrary to the opinion of other Romanists, hee thinkes it probable, that *Christs* Soule did descend to all the parts of Hell. But where doth the Scripture shew that *Christ* descended into any Hell but one? If therefore hee descended into the Hell of the damned (which yet I doe not say, nor believe that he did) then not into that Hell, which they call *Limbus Patrum*. 2. Those words *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell*, as spoken by *David* Psal. 16. and commented upon by *Peter Acts* 2. those words, I say, doe shew that *Hell* there mentioned could neither be the Hell of the damned, nor *Limbus Patrum*, or at least that there is no necessity to expound it of either. For 1. It is spoken of as a great benefit, a matter of joy and rejoycing, that *Christs* Soule was not left in Hell. *Therefore my Heart is glad, and my glory (or Tongue) rejoyced, &c. For thou wilt not leave, &c.* Psal. 16. 9, 10. Acts 2. 26, 27. But they that hold *Christs* descending either into the Hell of the damned, or into *Limbus Patrum*, make him to descend as a conquerour, one that went either to triumph over the Devill in his owne place, as it were; or to deliver the soules, that were in *limbus*. Now why should it be accounted such a benefit, such a matter of joy and rejoycing, for one not to be left there, where hee is onely as a conquerour, and deliverer? *Bellarmine* answers, that it was a benefit to *Christs* Soule, that it was quickly joyned againe unto the Body, even as it was evill to the Soule to be separated from the Body. *And thus* (saith hee) *it was a benefit unto him to be delivered from Hell, not in respect of the place, but in respect of separation from the body.* But who seeth not, that by this reason *Christs* Soule might as well be in Heaven, as either in *Limbus Patrum*, or the Hell of the damned? For though *Christs* soule were in heaven, yet it was a benefit unto it to be delivered out of that estate of separation, which it was in. 2. Those words, *Thou wilt not leave my soule in Hell*, were meant of *Christs* Resurrection, as S. *Peter* telleth us, *Acts*

Patres describunt terrorem gehennæ ac dæmonum in descensu Christi. ——Christus fuit in inferno liber, & liberator aliorum, ut omnes Patres clamant. *Bell. ubi supra.*

Respondeo beneficium fuisse animæ Christi, quòd celeriter corpori conjungeretur, sicut malum erat ei separatio: & hoc modo beneficium illi fuit liberatio ab inferno, non ratione loci, sed ratione separationis à corpore. *Bell. Ibid.*

Acts 2.31. But *Chriſts* Reſurrection, though it did preſuppoſe his being in Hell, either as Hell is taken for the grave, or for the ſtate of death, yet not as it is taken either for *Limbus Patrum*, or for the place of torment: Chriſt might well enough riſe againe, and yet never be in any ſuch Hell as one of theſe is, and the other is ſuppoſed to have beene. 3. S. *Peter* ſhewes, that *David* in thoſe words, *Thou wilt not leave my ſoule in Hell*, ſpake not of himſelfe, but of Chriſt; for that the words being underſtood of *David*, were not true, but moſt true, as underſtood of *Chriſt*. *Men and Brethren, let mee freely ſpeake unto you concerning the Patriarch David, that hee is both dead and buried, and his Sepulcher remaineth with us to this day. Therefore being a Prophet, &c.* Acts 2. 29,30,31. Here by *Davids* Sepulcher remaning with them unto that day, hee meanes, that *David* was left in that Hell of which he ſpeakes, and ſo did not ſpeake of himſelf, but of ſome other, *viz.* of *Chriſt*, who was not left in it. Thus alſo S. *Paul* having cited the latter part of the Verſe, *Thou Wilt not ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption*, hee alſo to prove that this was meant of *Chriſt*, and not of *David*, addes, *For David after he had ſerved his own Generation by the Will of God, fell aſleepe, and was laid with his Fathers, and ſaw corruption: But he, whom God raiſed up, ſaw no corruption.* Acts 13.35,36,37. *David* ſpake not of himſelfe, but of *Chriſt*, when hee ſaid, *Thou Wilt not ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption*; becauſe *David* did ſee corruption, which *Chriſt* did not ſee. So *David* ſpake not of himſelfe, but of *Chriſt*, when hee ſaid, *Thou Wilt not leave my ſoule in Hell*; becauſe *Davids* Soule was left in Hell, where *Chriſts* Soule was not left. This is the Apoſtles argument; and hence it neceſſarily followes, that by Hell cannot be meant either the place of torment, or yet *Limbus Patrum*: Not the place of torment; for *Davids* ſoule was not left in that Hell, it never came in it. Nor yet can that *Limbus* be meant; for even the Romaniſts themſelves doe hold that it was quite emptied before that time that *Peter* ſpake; and therefore *Davids* ſoule was not in it then, whereas yet *Peter* ſignifies, that then it was in that Hell, of which hee ſpake. By Hell therefore muſt be meant either the grave, or the ſtate of the dead. *Ruffinus* in his Expoſition of the *Creed*, obſerves that in his time the Article of *Chriſts* deſcending

Sciendum ſanè eſt, quòd in Eccleſiæ Romanæ ſymbolo non habetur additum, deſcendit ad inferna; ſed

neque in Orientis Eccleſiis habetur hic ſermo : vis tamen verbi eadem videtur eſſe in eo, quòd ſepultus dicitur. *Ruffin. in Symb.*

ſcending into Hell was not in the *Creed* of the Roman Church, and that the Eaſterne Churches had it not; yet hee ſaith, that it ſeemes to he implied in that which is ſpoken of *Chriſts* Buriall. And it is obſerved, that in all the ancient *Creedes*, that were within 600 years after *Chriſt*, except one which *Ruffinus* followed, if the article of *Chriſts* buriall were mentioned, then that of his deſcending into Hell was omitted; and if his deſcending into Hell were mentioned, then his buriall is omitted, which argues, that the antients did take theſe two, *viz. Chriſts* buriall and his deſcending into Hell, to import but one thing, or to differ but very little, and therefore thought it ſufficient to mention either the one, or the other. It is moſt evident that the Hebrew word *Sheol*, and ſo the Greeke *Hades*, which *Pſal.* 16. and *Acts* 2. are rendred *Hell*, are often taken for the grave. Some of the Romaniſts deny that *Sheol* is ever ſo uſed, but *Genebrard*, who was ſometimes Hebrew Profeſſour at *Paris*, doth confeſſe that they are in an errour; and there are many places of Scripture to convince them. *Gen.* 42. 38. *If miſchiefe befall him, &c. you ſhall bring down my gray haires with ſorrow to Sheol*, i. e. *the grave*. For to what Hell elſe ſhould gray haires goe down? So *Gen.* 44. 29. and 31. and 1 *King.* 2. 6. And *Job.* 17. 13. *If I waite, Sheol is mine Houſe*, that is, the grave, as appeares *v.* 14. *I have ſaid to corruption thou art my Father; and to the Worme, thou art my Mother, and Siſter.* So *Pſal.* 141. 7. *Our bones lie ſcattered at the mouth of Sheol*, i. e. the grave. So *Genebrard* upon the place expounds it *juxta Sepulchrum*, i. e. by the grave, whereas the vulgar Latine hath it *ſecus infernum*, neare Hell. But what Hell, except the grave, ſhould dead mens bones lie ſcattered by? So in many other places; and in all theſe places the Greeke verſion hath *Hades*, ſo that *Bellarmine* needed not to have made ſo ſtrange a matter of it as hee doth, that *Henry Stephen* in his great *Theſaurus*, ſhould ſay that *Hades* may be taken for the grave; neither had he cauſe to ſay that *Stephen*

B. Uſher *of Chriſts deſcent into Hell.*

In errore verſantur, qui eam vocem (Sheol) nunquam ſepulchrum deſignare contendunt. *Genebr. in Symbol. Athanaſ.*

H. Stephanus in ſuo magno Theſauro in gratiam Bezæ (ut videtur)

dicit poſſe accipi pro ſepulchro vocem ἅδης, ſed nullũ invenire potuit auctorem, qui ita locutus fuiſſet. *Bell. de Chriſti anima l.* 4. *c.* 10.

could

could finde no Authour that did uſe the word in that ſenſe. I have not now *Stephens Theſaurus* to looke into, but ſure I am, that a man of farre leſſe reading then *Stephen* was of, might have alledged many examples to that purpoſe. And for the Hebrew word *Sheol*, *Genebrard* and *Bellarmine* pretend that the *Chaldie* Paraphraſt, and the Rabbines doe expound it גיהינום *Gehinnom*, which ſignifies the place where the damned are in torment. But 1. If it were ſo, this were nothing to that *Limbus* which they contend for. 2. Neither is it true, that thoſe authors doe uſually ſo expound the word. For the *Chaldie* Paraphraſt for the moſt part keepeth the Hebrew word *Sheol* it ſelfe, onely ſometimes it is a little changed שיול *Shiol*: and many times doth hee uſe the word קבורא *Kebura*, or קבורתא *Keburta*, that is, the Grave, to expreſſe the Hebrew *Sheol* by; or, which is the ſame in effect, כי קברוהא *Be Keburta*, or בית קבורתא *i.e.* the houſe of the Grave. As *Job.*7.9. and 14.13. and 17.13. and 16. *Pſal.*89.48. and 141.7. and *Eccleſ.* 9.10. In all theſe places doth the *Chaldie* Pharaphraſt render the Hebrew word *Sheol* the grave, or the houſe of the grave; let any Romaniſt ſhew that hee renders it ſo often by that word, which ſignifies the place of torment, though (as I ſaid before) that were nothing to their *Limbus Patrum*. And thus alſo doe the Rabbines interpret the word *Sheol*, *R. Levi* ſaith that *Sheol* doth ſignifie the Grave, and that, therefore it is put for Death, 2 *Sam.* 22.6. So alſo *R. Nathan Mordecai* in his Hebrew Concordance ſaith, that the interpretation of *Sheol* is the Grave. *Aben Ezra* alſo ſaith the ſame in his commentary on *Gen.* 37.35. And moreover he taxeth the vulgar Latine Tranſlatour for interpreting *Sheol* there Hell, ſuppoſing him to have meant the Hell of the damned. *Kimchi* likewiſe ſaith that thoſe words *Pſal.*16.10. *thou wilt not ſuffer thy holy one to ſee corruption*, are but a repetition of that which went before, *Thou wilt not leave my ſoule in Hell.* Which ſhewes that hee tooke *Sheol* (there rendred *Hell*) for the Grave. It is true, ſometimes the Rabbines

Bell Ibid. Geneb. in Symb. Athan.

והנה קרא שאול מות כי הוא שם לקבר R. Levi in 2 Sam. 22.6.

פירושו קבר שאול R. Nathan de voce in Concord.

הטעם הקבר Ab. Ezra in Gen. 37.35

ופה שעה המתכנם לתועים שתרגם שאילה גיהינם Ab. Ezra. *Ibil.*

כפל ענין במלות שונות Kimchi ad Pſal. 16. 10.

bines expound *Sheol* by *Gehinnam*, i.e. Hell, the place of torment, but they doe not hold that to be the ſimple and genuine ſignification of the word; as appeares by *R. Solomon* on *Gen.*37. 35. who ſaith that *Sheol* there, according to the literall Expoſition, is the Grave, and that *Jacobs* meaning was, that hee would goe mourning to the Grave, and would not be comforted; but that according to the myſticall Expoſition, by *Sheol* there is meant *Gehinnam*, the Hell of the damned.

כפשוטו לשון קבר הוא
באבלי אקבר ולא אתנחם
כל ימי ובמדרשו גיהנם
R. Sal. ad Gen. 37. 35.

So *Kimchi* upon thoſe words *Pſal.*9. 17. *The wicked ſhall be turned into Hell*, where the Hebrew is *Sheol*, interprets it, *Let the wicked be turned into the Grave*, and afterwards addes, that myſtically there by *Sheol* is underſtood *Gehinnam*, the place of torment.

ישובו רשעים לקבר
ובדרש לשאולא הוא גיהנם
Kimchi ad Pſal.9. 17.

Obj. But they ſay that in theſe words, *Thou wilt not leave my ſoule in Hell*, the Grave cannot be meant by *Hell*, becauſe the Grave is not a place for the ſoule, but for the body.

Anſw. The word *Soule* is ſometimes put for the body, or (which is all one) for man conſidered in reſpect of the body. As *Gen.*46.26. *All the ſoules that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loines, &c.* There by *ſoules* are meant bodies, or perſons in reſpect of their bodies; for ſo generally both Proteſtants and Romaniſts doe hold, that not the Soules properly, but the Bodies of children doe proceede from the loines of their Parents. Yea, and ſometimes by *Soule* is meant the Body, when the Soule is departed out of it. As *Num.*19.13. *Whoſoever toucheth the dead Body of any man, &c.* There the word rendred *dead Body*, is that which *Pſal.* 16. 10. and ſo uſually elſewhere is rendred *Soule*. * *Bellarmine* to take away this anſwer, ſaith that there is great difference betwixt the Hebrew word *Nepheſh*

לנפש

*Dico multum inter נפש & ψυχὴ intereſſe. Nam נפש eſt generaliſſima vox, & ſignificat ſine ullo tropo tam animam, quàm animal, imò etiam corpus, ut patet ex plurimis Scripturæ locis.——At Græcum ψυχὴ ut Latinum anima, non eſt tam generale, ut ſine tropo poſſit accipi pro toto animali. Itaque in Levitico non ponitur pars pro parte, i.e. anima pro corpore, ſed vocabulum, quod ipſum corpus ſignificare ſolet; aut certè ponitur totum pro parte, i.e. vivens pro corpore. At Act.2. ponitur ψυχή, quæ animam ſolam ſignificat. *Bell. de Chriſti animâ l.* 4. *c.*12.

and

and the Greeke *Pſyche*, both which are rendred ſoule. For *Nepheſh* (hee ſaith) is a moſt generall word, and without any trope doth ſignifie both Soule, and living creature, yea and the Body alſo. But the Greeke *Pſyche* (he ſaith) and ſo the Latine *Anima*, is not ſo generall, as without a trope to ſignifie the whole living creature. And therefore in * *Leviticus* (he ſaith) one part is not put for another, *viz.* the Soule for the Body, but there is the word that uſually ſignifies the Body it ſelfe: or the whole is put for the part, that is, the living creature for the Body. But in *Acts* 2. is uſed the word *Pſyche*, which doth ſignifie the Soule onely. Thus *Bellarmine*; but a pitty it is to ſee how a learned man, rather then hee will ſubmit to truth, doth plunge himſelfe into abſurdity, yea more abſurdities then one. But to paſſe by the reſt, this is moſt groſſe, that *Bellarmine* doth ſo diſtinguiſh betwixt *Nepheſh* and *Pſyche*, as if the former ſometimes did ſignifi the whole living creature, or the Body onely, but not ſo the latter; when as in theſe very places of *Leviticus*, which *Bellarmine* doth ſpeake of, *viz.* *Levit.* 21.1. and 11. as in the Hebrew the word *Nepheſh*, ſo in the Greeke the word *Pſyche* is uſed; and therefore it is apparently falſe, that the Greeke word *Pſyche* doth ſignifie the Soule onely. Yea, but ſaith *Bellarmine*, when even *Nepheſh* is oppoſed to fleſh, it cannot be taken for fleſh. Now here ſoule is oppoſed to fleſh, *his ſoule was not left in Hell, neither his fleſh did ſee corruption. Acts* 2. 31. And therefore here by no meanes can ſignifie a dead body.

* Levit. 21.1. *and* 11. *where alſo* Nepheſh *i. e. Soule, is put for Body, yea for dead Body.*

Ἐν ταῖς Ψυχαῖς ἀ μιανθήσονται. *Levit.* 21.1.

Καὶ ἐπὶ πάσῃ Ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυίᾳ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται. *Ibid.* v. 11.

Præterea etiam Nephes, quando oponitur carni, non poteſt ſumi pro carne.—Hic autem anima opponitur carni, cum dicitur, neque anima relicta eſt in inferno, neque caro vidit corruptionem. Ergo hoc loco nullo modo tolerari poteſt Bezæ interpretatio, qui pro animâ cadaver intelligi voluit. *Bell. Ibid.*

I anſwer, that in thoſe words *Acts* 2.31. there is no oppoſition betwixt *Soule* and *Fleſh*, no more then there is an oppoſition betwixt *Leave* and *Forſake* in thoſe words *Heb.* 13.6. *I will not leave thee, nor forſake thee.* So then notwithſtanding any thing that is objected, in thoſe words, *Thou wilt not leave my Soule in Hell*, by *Hell* may be meant the Grave, and by *Soule* the

Body. But if the word *Soule* be taken properly, then by *Hell* is to be underſtood the power of death, or the ſtate of the dead. And thus doe Romiſh Writers ſometimes expound the word Hell. As *Janſenius* upon thoſe words *Prov.* 15. 11. *Hell and deſtruction are before the Lord*, notes that by *Hell* and *deſtruction* is ſignified the ſtate of the dead, not onely of the damned, as wee uſually conceive when we heare thoſe words, but the ſtate of all in generall, that are departed out of this life. So *Genebrard* expounds that *Pſalme* 30. 3. *Thou haſt brought up my Soule from Sheol*, from Hell, as the vulgar Latine reades it, he expounds it, I ſay, thus, *Thou haſt delivered me from the ſtate of the dead.* So likewiſe the ſame author upon *Pſal.* 88. (or 89.) 48. ſaith, *Hell doth ſignifie the whole ſtate of the dead.* Thus generally all that die, whether they be godly, or wicked, are ſaid as in reſpect of the Body to goe to the Grave, ſo in reſpect of the Soule to deſcend into Hell.

Per infernum & perditionem ſignificatur ſtatus mortuorum, & non ſolùm damnationum, ut nos ferè ex his vocibus auditis concipimus, ſed in genere ſtatus defunctorum. *Janſen. in Prov.* 15. 11.

Ab inferno, id eſt, è ſtatu mortuorum liberaſti. *Genebr. ad Pſal.* 29. 4. *vel.* 30. 3.

Infernus ſignificat totum mortuorum ſtatum. *Genebr. ad Pſal.* 88. 48.

This is the Law of humane neceſſity, (ſaith *Hilary*) *that when mens bodies are buried, their ſoules deſcend into Hell; which deſcent the Lord to prove himſelfe true man, did not refuſe.* The words alſo of S. *Peter* doe confirme this Expoſition, *viz.* that *Hell*, in which Chriſts Soule was, but was not left, is the ſtate of the dead, or the power of death; *Whom God hath raiſed up, having looſed the paines of death, becauſe it was not poſſible that hee ſhould be holden of it. For* David *ſpeaketh concerning him, &c. Acts* 2. 24. &c. To prove that CHRIST could not be held by death (be ſtill kept under the power of it) *Peter* alledgeth the words of *David* concerning *Chriſt*, *Thou wilt not leave my Soule in Hell.* Therefore Chriſts not being left in Hell ſignifies nothing elſe, but tis not being left under the power of death: and conſequently his being in Hell importeth nothing elſe but his being under the power of death, under which hee was kept for a while, *viz.* untill his Reſurrection. And this may ſuffice for anſwer

Humanæ iſta lex neceſſitatis, ut conſepultis corporibus ad inferos animæ deſcendant. Quam deſcenſionem Dominus ad conſummationem veri hominis non recuſavit. *Hilar. in Pſal.* 138.

κεφ. ιδ.

anſwer to the Objection from *Acts* 2.27. The next place Objected is 1 *Pet.*3.18, 19. of which place I marvell that the Marqueſſe ſhould ſay that it is yet plainer then either of the former. *Auſtine* being conſulted by *Evodius* about the meaning of that place, confeſſeth that it did exceedingly puzzle him, and that hee durſt not affirme any thing about it. And the Jeſuite *Lorinus* in his Commentary upon it, calles it *difficillimum locum*, a moſt difficult place, and rehearſes ten ſeverall Expoſitions of it. And So *Eſtius* alſo upon the place ſaith, *This place* in the judgement almoſt of all *Interpreters is moſt difficult, and is ſo diverſly expounded, that* John Lorinus *doth reckon up nine interpretations of it, to which hee addes his own for the tenth; and yet he hath not touched all neither.* And both he and *Lorinus* note that only *Arias Montanus* did thinke the place eaſie to be underſtood, but withall that his Expoſition of it is ſuch, as that others will not eaſily embrace it. For, as they relate, *Arias* by the *ſpirits in priſon* doth underſtand thoſe eight perſons, that were ſhut up in the Arke, which was a kinde of priſon unto them. *Bellarmine* alſo upon occaſion of this controverſie about *Limbus Patrum*, and Chriſts deſcending into Hell, treating of this place of *Peter*, ſaith that it hath alwayes beene accounted a moſt obſcure place. Some have thought that by *Priſon* in thoſe words of *Peter* is meant Hell, the place of torment, and that Chriſt went and Preached there, and that ſuch, as did then believe were delivered. And thus * *Hilary* ſeemes to have underſtood it, who ſaith, that *the Apoſtle Peter doth teſtifie, that When Chriſt deſcended into Hell, exhortation was Preachde alſo to thoſe that were in the Priſon, who had ſometimes beene incredulous in the dayes of Noah.* For this opinion *Hilary* is taxed (though

Queſtio, quam mihi propoſuiſti ex Epiſtolâ Apoſtoli Petri, ſolet nos, ut te latere non arbitror, vehementiſſimè commovere, &c. *Aug. Epiſt.* 99. Vides quàm latebroſum ſit, & quæ me moveant, ne affirmare hinc aliquid audeam. *Ibid.*

Locus hic omnium penè interpretum judicio difficillimus, idemque tam variè expoſitus, ut novem ejus interpretationes recenſeat Jo. Lorinus, quibus ipſe ſuam addit decimam; tametſi nec omnes attigerit. *Eſt. ad* 1 *Pet.* 3. 29.

Ut autem hic locus, qui ſemper obſcuriſſimus habitus eſt, intelligatur, &c. *Bell. de Chriſti animâ lib.* 4. *cap.* 13.

* Scit ergo (*David*) exhortationē hanc ſanctos quieſcentes in inferno deſiderare; ſcit, teſtante Apoſtolo Petro, deſcendente in inferna Domino, etiam his, qui in carcere erant, & increduli quondam fuerant in diebus Noe, exhortationem prædicatam fuiſſe. *Hilar. in Pſal.* 118. (*vel* 119.) 81. *&c.*

not named) by *Bede*, as *Eſtius* obſerves, who yet indeavours to excuſe *Hilary*, as not meaning by this *Priſon* the Hell of the damned, but Purgatory; and in that ſenſe * *Eſtius* himſelfe alſo doth underſtand the words of *Peter*, *viz.* that by *the ſpirits in priſon* are meant the ſoules of thoſe that were in paine and torment for the expiating of their ſinnes, untill that Chriſt came, and Preached deliverance unto them. But of Purgatory I ſhall ſpeake hereafter; in the meane time ſo much is obtained, that if the place be meant of Purgatory, then not of *Limbus Patrum*, for that place (as they deſcribe it) did much differ from Purgatory, as being a place (they ſay) in which was no paine or torment.

* Hilarius diſtinguit ſanctos in inferno quieſcentes, *i.e.* in ſinu Abrahæ tunc poſitos, ab iis, qui in carcere erant, ut in loco pœnali, vetera adhuc peccatorum ſuorum debita luentes; quem locum Purgatorium vocamus. *Eſt. ubi ſuprà.* Prædicavit—animabus, quæ apud inferos in carcere, velut pœnarum loco, concluſæ detinebantur——Propter peccata ſua quoad pœnam adhuc expianda, apud inferos carceri & cruciatibus addicti remanſerunt, uſque ad Chriſti Redemptoris adventum. *Eſt. Ibid.*

But it may ſeeme ſtrange that the Marqueſſe ſhould alledge *Auſtine Epiſt. 99.* as holding that by the priſon, which *Peter* ſpeaketh of, is meant *Limbus Patrum*, when as indeed *Auſtine* in that Epiſtle is much againſt it. For beſides what I have before cited out of that Epiſtle, hee ſaith that *Chriſt by the beatificall preſence of his Divinity did never depart from thoſe juſt perſons that were in Abrahams boſome*, (which the Marqueſſe ſaith, is the ſame place with that called *Limbus Patrum*) and therefore hee did not finde what Chriſt did for them, when hee deſcended into Hell. And having conſidered what hee could of the words of *Peter*, hee rather thought that they did not ſpeake of Hell at all. And therefore by *the ſpirits in priſon* hee conceived to be meant men, that lived in the dayes of *Noah*, whoſe ſoules were in their mortall bodies, as in a priſon; to which men, hee ſaith, Chriſt by his Spirit in *Noah* did Preach, though they yet nevertheleſſe would not believe. *Bellarmine* and *Eſtius* and others doe acknowledge this

Unle illis juſtis, qui in ſinu Abrahæ erant, cum ille in inferna deſcenderet, nondum quid contulerit, inveni; à quibus eum ſecundum beatificam præſentiam ſuæ divinitatis nunquam video receſſiſſe. *Auguſt. Epiſt. 99.*

Conſidera tamen, ne fortè totum illud, quod de concluſis in carcere ſpiritibus, qui in diebus Noe non crediderant, Petrus Apoſtolus dicit, omninò ad inferos non pertineat *Aug. Ibid.*

Bell. & Eſt. locis antè citat.

to

to have beene the opinion of *Auſtine* in that Epiſtle concerning the words of *Peter*. And *Bellarmine* alſo doth confeſſe, that this of *Auſtine* doth differ but little from *Bezaes* Expoſition of the place, *viz.* that by *the ſpirits in priſon* are meant the ſoules of men, which were now, when *Peter* wrote of them, in priſon, that is, in Hell, to which men Chriſt by his Divine Spirit in *Noah* did Preach, when they were alive upon Earth. And ſurely any that are impartiall, will judge this Expoſition in that, wherein it differs from *Auſtines*, the more probable: and yet *Bellarmine*, to ſhew his partiality, ſaith that hee would not have refuted *Auſtines* Expoſition, if *Auſtine* himſelfe had beene altogether pleaſed with it. *Auſtines* Expoſition is embraced not onely by *Bede*, whom *Bellarmine* onely mentions as herein following *Auſtine*, but alſo by *Aquinas*, and others, as *Eſtius* obſerves, who alſo addes that *Heſſelius* (a Romiſh Authour) doth underſtand the place much after the ſame manner. And, as *Lorinus* doth relate, *Diegus Paiva*, one that wrote in defence of the Councell of *Trent*, doth directly expound the words of *Peter* as *Beza* doth, though hee would not have it thought that *Paiva* did receive his Expoſition from *Beza*. But againſt both *Auſtines* and *Bezaes* Expoſition it is objected firſt, that *the Spirit by which Chriſt went and Preached to the ſpirits in priſon*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 18, 19. is oppoſed to the *Fleſh*; and therefore muſt ſignifie Chriſts Soule, and not his Divine Nature. I anſwer, that Chriſts Divine Nature is moſt fitly underſtood there by the word *Spirit*, even as by the word *Fleſh* is to be underſtood not onely his Body, but his whole humane Nature, in reſpect of which nature Chriſt was put to death, and was qnickned by his Divine Nature. Thus doth *Oecumenius* expound it, *Put to death in the nature of fleſh, that is, the humane Nature, and raiſed againe by the power of the Divine Nature.* And why ſhould this Expoſition ſeeme ſtrange,

Hanc Expoſitionem non refutarem, ſi ipſi Auguſtino placeret omninò, &c *Bell. ubi ſuprà.*

Prima expoſitio eſt Auguſtini Epiſt. 99. ad Evod. quem ſequitur Beda. *Bell. Ibid.*

Sequitur hanc Expoſitionem Beda in Comment. & Thomas 3. q. 52. ar. 2. ad 3. cum paucis aliis. Non diſſimilis ſententia eſt Jo. Heſſelii, &c. *Eſt. ad* 1 *Pet.* 3. 19.

Lorin. in 1 *Pet.* 3.

Spiritus, qui hìc diſtinguitur contra carnem, non videtur poſſe ſignificare aliud quàm animam, &c. *Bell. loc. citat.*

Θανατωθεὶς μὲν τῇ φύσει τῆς σαρκὸς, τελέσι τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ, ἀναστὰς δὲ τῇ δυνάμει τῆς θεότητος. *Oecum. ad loc.*

when as *Fleſh* is put for Chriſts humane Nature, *Joh.* 1.14. *The Word was made Fleſh.* And ſo alſo *Rom.* 1.3. and 9.5. And therefore on the other ſide the word *Spirit* may well denote Chriſts Divine Nature. For this Expoſition *Eſtius* alſo cites *Auſtine*, and *Athanaſius* as alledged by *Bede*. And he doth well obſerve, that this ſenſe agrees with that which is ſaid of Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 13.4. *For though he was crucified through weakeneſſe, yet hee liveth by the power of God.* Beſides, if wee ſhould reade *quickened in the Spirit*, and by *Spirit* underſtand Chriſts Soule, it would follow, that Chriſts Soule was ſometime dead. This was *Auſtines* argument againſt that Expoſition, as is obſerved by *Bellarmine*. Who ſaith that the argument doth not conclude; for that often in the Scripture that is ſaid to be quickned, which is not put to death. But his anſwer is not ſatisfactory. For though it is true, that in the Scripture to quicken or to make alive is ſometimes no more then to preſerve and keepe alive; as 1 *Sam.* 27.11. and 2 *Sam.* 8.2. where both in the Originall, and in the vulgar Latine the word uſed doth ſignifie to make alive. Yet nevertheleſſe nothing in Scripture is ſaid to be made, that is, kept alive, but that which is obnoxious unto death, and may die: but Chriſts Soule, and generally the Soules of men are of an immortall nature, and doe not die, when the body dyeth. Beſides, what great matter was it (as *Eſtius* obſerves) if when Chriſts Body died, his Soule did remaine alive; when as even in the worſt men that are, the ſoule doth not die, as being by nature immortall? And therefore hee ſaith it is better underſtood thus, Chriſt was quickned in the Spirit, that is, hee was made a quickning Spirit, *viz.* when hee roſe from death unto life immortall. And hee cites that 1 *Cor.* 15.45. *The firſt man Adam was made a living Soule; the laſt Adam was made a quickning ſpirit.* But that ſenſe will not well ſuite the words of *Peter*, which doe not ſhew what Chriſt is made being riſen againe, but in what re-

Sed hæc ratio non concludit; nam in Scripturâ paſſim dicitur vivificari id, quòd non occiditur. 1. *Reg.* 27. Virum & mulierem non vivificabat David, i.e. non relinquebat vivum. *Bell. de Chr. an. l.* 4. *c.* 13. *ubi etiam alia iſtiuſmodi exempla affert.*

חחיה
vivificare.

Quid magnum, ſi anima Chriſti, moriente carne, vivens permanſit; quando nec in peſſimis hominibus anima moritur ut quæ naturâ ſit immortalis. *Eſt. ad* 1 *Pet.* 3.18.
Proinde meliùs intelligitur Chriſtus vivificatus ſpiritus, i. e. animâ: quiâ factus eſt in ſpiritum vivificantem, hunc ſcil. quando à morte Reſurrexit ad vitam immortalem. *Eſt. Ibid.*

reſpect and by what meanes hee did riſe againe, *viz.* by the ſpirit, that is, by his Divine Nature, as in the fleſh, that is, his humane Nature hee was put to death. But againe it is objected, that S. *Peter* ſaith Chriſt *went and preached to the ſpirits in priſons*; therefore it is meant of the ſoule, not of his Divine Nature, in which reſpect it cannot be ſaid but improperly that hee went. I anſwer, there is no neceſſity to take it properly in the words of *Peter*, more then in the words of *Paul*, *Epheſ.* 2. 17. when hee ſaith that Chriſt *came and Preached peace unto the Epheſians*; which muſt be meant of comming and Preaching by the Apoſtle; for otherwiſe Chriſt in his owne perſon did not come and preach unto them. And thus *Eſtius* notes it to be expounded by *Ambroſe*, the Interlineary Gloſſe, *Aquinas*, *Lyra*, and *Cajetane*. It is objected againe, that by *ſpirits in priſon* cannot be underſtood living men, except S. *Peter* ſhould on purpoſe ſpeake improperly and obſcurely. I anſwer, according to *Bezaes* Expoſition, (which in his particular doth differ from *Auſtines*, and is the more probable) not living men, but the ſoules of men ſeparated from their bodies, are termed *ſpirits in priſon*, as being in the priſon of Hell when *Peter* wrote of them; though they were not ſo, but were joyned to their bodies, and ſo both ſoules and bodies joyned together were living men, when Chriſt preached unto them. But *Bellarmine* further objects that 1 *Pet.* 4. 6. where it is ſaid, that *the Goſpell was preached to the dead*, which hee will have ſo underſtood, as that men being dead, and departed out of this life, the Goſpell was Preached unto them. But the true and genuine meaning of the words rather is this, that the Goſpell was Preached to them, that are now dead; though they were not dead, but alive when the Goſpell was preached unto them. Even as in the verſe immediately going before it is ſaid, that Chriſt *will judge both the quick and the dead*, that is, thoſe that are now alive, or ſhall be alive at Chriſts comming; and thoſe that are now dead, or ſhall be dead at Chriſts comming; who yet

Illud, veniens prædicavit, ſi de animâ intelligatur, propriè accipi poterit: vere enim venit ad locum, ubi non erat: at ſi de Divinitate, non poteſt accipi niſi impropriè. *Bell. loc. cit.*

Per ſpiritus, qui in carcere erant, non videtur poſſe intelligi homines viventes, niſi de induſtriâ S. Petrus affectaverit improprietatem, & obſcuritatem. *Bell. nbi ſuprà.*

Bell. Ibid.

yet ſhall not be judged whiles they are dead, but they ſhall be raiſed up, and made alive, and ſo be judged. As therefore *Peter* calles them dead, becauſe ſo they are now, and were, when hee wrote of them, though they ſhall not be dead, but alive, when they ſhall be judged. So for the ſame reaſon hee calles them dead, to whom the Goſpell was preached, though when the Goſpell was preached unto them they were alive, and not dead. And in like manner hee calles them *ſpirits in priſon*, to whom Chriſt went aud Preached, becauſe ſo they were when hee wrote, though they were not ſo when Chriſt went and preached unto them. But *Bellarmine* chargeth *Beza* with being ſo bold as to change the Text, becauſe where they reade, *the ſpirits that were in priſon*, hee reades, *the ſpirits that are in priſon*. But, as *Bellarmine* himſelfe could not but coufeſſe, in the Originall there is neither *that were*, nor *that are*, but the words are (as our Tranſlatours render them) *the ſpirits in priſon*; ſo that either the words *that were*, or *that are*, may be underſtood, as the ſenſe will beare. *Eſtius* confeſſeth that ſome (I ſuppoſe, he meanes ſome not Proteſtants) underſtand, *that are*: but hee holds it better to underſtand, *that were*, as the verbe is of the Pretertenſe, *preached*. But this reaſon is of no moment. For if becauſe the word *Preached* hath reference to the time paſt, therefore it muſt be meant of the Spirits that were in priſon, when *Chriſt* Preached unto them: by the ſame reaſon when it is ſaid that *Chriſt ſhall judge both the quick and the dead*, becauſe *ſhall judge* doth reſpect the time to come, therefore alſo it muſt be meant of thoſe that ſhall be dead, when *Chriſt* ſhall judge them. But this doth not follow; and ſo neither doth the other. And thus, I hope, it may appear, that thoſe words of *Peter* make nothing for *Limbus Patrum*. The fourth and laſt place of Scripture, which is alledged by the Marqueſſe is *Zach.* 9. 11. where *the pit* that is ſpoken of, hee ſaith, cannot be the place of the damned, nor the Grave. But what then? muſt it therefore be *Limbus Patrum*? It doth

Auguſtinus ſervat textum, ut invenit à majoribus Scriptum: Beza pro ſuâ audaciâ mutat, & ubi nos habemus, Qui in carcere erant, ipſe vult legi, Qui in carcere ſunt. *Bell. loc cit.*

τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι.

Quamvis nonnulli (ſunt) ſupplendum putent, multò tamen meliùs noſter interpres, ut alii fere omnes (erant) ſuppleverant. Nam verbum præteriti temporis (prædicavit) ſupplementum poſtulat temporis conſimilis, erant, vel fuerant, eo ſcil. tempore, quo prædicavit. *Eſt. ad loc.*

doth not follow; for by the pit there may be ſomething elſe meant then either the place of the damned, or the Grave, or *Limbus Patrum, viz.* the Babyloniſh captivity, as the Rabbines upon the place expound it. *Bellarmine* citing *Calvin* for this Expoſition ſaith, that it hath no probability, becauſe immediatly before there is a prophecy of Chriſt, *Rejoyce greatly O Daughter of Sion, behold thy King commeth unto thee, &c.* Therefore (ſaith he) how ſhould theſe things cohere, if the captivity of Babylon were ſpoken of? I anſwer, well enough; the Prophet having told them of *Chriſts* comming unto them, might well preſently after ſpeak of their deliverance out of captivity, as a great benefit which they had allready obtained through Chriſt (*in whom all the promiſes are yea, and in him amen*, 2 *Cor.* 1.20.) and whereby they might be aſſured of far greater benefit by him, even of deliverance from the captivity of ſinne and Satan. *Eſtius* in his Expoſition of the hard places of Scripture, treating of this place, ſaith indeed that many underſtand it of Chriſts deſcending into Hell, and delivering thence the ſoules of the juſt; but withall hee tells us, that it is diverſly expounded, and that one Expoſition is, that *Chriſt by the Merit of his Paſſion did free all the Elect, who were held captive under the power of the Devill. And thus* (hee ſaith) *the pit, wherein is no water, is the captivity of mankinde, in which ſo long as it is held, it is empty of the water of Divine Grace.* Diverſe Romaniſts doe cite *Hierome* as interpreting this place of the Prophet *Zachary*, of *Limbus Patrum*, and of Chriſts deſcending thither: But they that peruſe *Hieromes* owne words, will finde, that hee neither ſpeakes of Chriſts deſcending, nor of *Limbus Patrum*; and that indeed hee meant onely that which *Eſtius* expreſſeth. Hee giveth, the ſenſe of the Prophets words thus; *By the blood of thy paſſion, thou through thy clemency haſt delivered thoſe, who were held bound in the priſon of Hell, in which there is no mercy.* And hee addes

R. *Sal. Kimchi and Abrahaneel. Bell. de chr. au. l. 4. c. 11.*

Quomodo ergò iſta cohærerent, ſi de captivitate Babylonicâ ageretur? *Bell. Ibid.*

Variè hoc exponitur — Unus ſenſus eſt, Chriſtum per Meritum Paſſionis ſuæ omnes electos ſuos, qui tenebantur tanquam vincti ſub poteſtate diaboli, liberaſſe. —— Sic lacus, in quo non eſt aqua, eſt captivitas humani generis, quâ quamdiù detinetur, vacuum eſt ab aquâ Divinæ gratiæ. *Eſt. ad Zach. 9. 11.*

Bell. loco proximè citato. Ribera ad loc. Annotat. on the Doway-Tranſlation.

Quod ita intelligitur; In ſanguine paſſionis tuæ, eos, qui vincti in carcere tenebantur inferni, in quo non eſt ulla miſericordiâ, tuâ clementiâ liberaſti. —— In hoc lacu inferni morabatur dives ille quondam pur-

puratus, cujus lingua magniloqua pænarũ exurebatur incendiis; & in tantũ non habebat ulla aquarum refrigeria, ut extremi digiti pauperis tincti in aquâ refrigerium postularet. *Hieron. ad Zach. 9. 11.*

a little after, that the rich man spoken of *Luke* 16. was in that pit, which was so void of all water of comfort, that hee desired *Lazarus* might but dip the tip of his finger in water to coole his Tongue. Here it is evident, that *Hierome* by *the pit without water* understands the Hell of the damned, which is without all comfort, though the Marquesse say that place cannot here be meant. Now whereas *Hierome* saith that *Christ* by his Passion did deliver those that were bound in that prison, I suppose hee did not meane, that any being once in Hell, as that rich man that he mentioneth, were afterwards delivered out of it; himself seemes to exclude that sence, when hee saith, that *in that prison there is no mercy, viz.* to be obtained: but his meaning was, that such, as by reason of sinne were in the state of damnation, *Christ* did deliver by his Passion. But thus neither this place of *Zachary*, nor any other place of Scripture doth prove a *Limbus Patrum*, or that *Christ* descended into Hell in that sense as they of the Church of *Rome* maintaine. For the Fathers, whom the Marquesse citeth, *Austine* in *Psal.* 37. 1. hath nothing about *Limbus Patrum*, or *Christs* descending into Hell; and I have shewed before that he gathered by the Scripture, that *Abrahams bosome*, was no such *Limbus*, as the Romanists imagine: yea, that hee held the Saints that died before *Christs* incarnation to have alwayes enjoyed the beatificall presence of Christs Divinity, which is point blanke contrary to their opinion. *Hierome*, I grant, in *Ephes.* 4. 9. seemeth to speake for them, where hee saith, *By the lower parts of the Earth is understood Hell, to which our Lord and Saviour descended, that he might victoriously carry with him to Heaven the soules of the Saints, which were kept there. Whereupon also after his Resurrection many bodies of the just were seene in the holy City.*

Inferiora autem terræ infernus accipitur, ad quem Dominus noster Salvatorque descendit, ut sanctorum animas, quæ ibi tenebantur inclusæ, secum ad cælos victor abduceret. Vnde & post Resurrectionem ejus, plurima corpora justorum in sanctâ civitate visa sunt. *Hieron. ad Eph. 4. 9.*

Ascendens quippe in altum, captivam duxit captivitatem. Nos qui nunc in Christum credimus de gentibus congregati, cum essemus creatura Dei,

But *Hieromes* meaning might be onely this, that *Christ* by the vertue and efficacy of his death, did deliver the Soules of all Saints (whether before or after his coming

ming) from Hell, which otherwiſe by reaſon of ſinne was the place that did belong unto them. Thus a little before upon thoſe words, *when hee aſcended up on high, hee led captivity captive*, *Hierome* doth expreſſe himſelfe, ſaying, *Wee, who now believe in Chriſt, were taken captive by the Devill, and were delivered over to his officers. Therefore our Lord Ieſus Chriſt came, bringing with him the veſſels of captivity, and preached remiſſion to thoſe that were taken, and deliverance to thoſe that were bound; and delivered us from the Chaines, and Fetters of our enemies. And having deliver'd us, and by a new captivity brought us out of our old captivity, he carried us with him into Heaven.* Hee cannot here meane, that we were actually in Hell, and then from thence, delivered, and carried up with Chriſt into Heaven. But his meaning muſt needs be this, that whereas ſinne had brought us under condemnation, ſo that nothing but Hell did remaine for us, Chriſt by his death delivered us, and made a way for us into Heaven, into which otherwiſe wee could finde no entrance. After the ſame manner very well may the other words be underſtood ſo as to import no ſuch place as they call *Limbus Patrum*. However hee meant, yet it appeares ſufficiently by the words of *Auſtine* before cited, that the opinion of *Limbus Patrum* was not generally received in that time wherein *Hierome* lived, *Auſtine* and hee being contemporaries. The other Father yet remaining, is *Gregory*, but there is no ſuch place as that mentioned, *viz. li.*13.*Mor.ca.* 20. for that booke hath onely 17. Chapters in it: yet I finde *Bellarmine* alſo to cite *Gregory* after the very ſame manner, yea and to bid us alſo ſee *Cap.* 21. But the words, which *Bellarmine* citeth as out of *Cap.*20. are indeed in *Cap.*15. *viz. Whiles our Maſter and Redeemer penetratiug the cloyſters of Hell, did bring out from thence the ſoules of the Elect, hee ſuffers not us to goe thither, from whence by deſcending hee did deliver others.*

à diabolo capti ſumus, & ejus ſatellitibus diſtributi. Venit igitur Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus, ſecundum Ezechielem, vaſa captivitatis ſecum apportans, & operto capite (ne ab adverſariis cognoſceretur) prædicavit his, qui capti erant, remiſſionem, & qui tenebantur in vinculis ſolutionem, & nos de catenis hoſtium, & de compedibus liberavit. *Hieron. ad Epheſ.* 4. 8.

Liberatoſque nos, & per novam captivitatem de captivitate veteri erutos, ſecum duxit in cælum. *Ibid.*

Bell. de Chriſt. anim. l. 4. *c.*14.

Dum conditor ac redemptor noſter clauſtra inferni penetrans, electorum exinde animas eduxit, nos illo ire non patitur, unde jam alios deſcendendo liberavit. *Gregor. Moral. lib.* 13.*cap.*15.

Priores etenim ſancti & ſuſtinere adverſa poterant, & tamen à corporibus educti, adhuc ab inferni locis liberari non poterant: quia necdum venerat, qui illuc ſine culpâ deſcenderet, ut eos, qui ibi tenebantur ex culpâ, liberaret. *Ibid. c. 16.*

Theſe words of *Gregory* might admit of the ſame Expoſition with thoſe of *Hierome* before ſpoken of, but that in the next Chapter he is more plaine ſaying, *The former Saints could indure adverſity, but yet they could not be delivered from Hell, when they died, becauſe hee was not yet come, who ſhould deſcend thither without ſinne, that hee might deliver thoſe, who were held there by reaſon of ſinne.* But the reaſon that *Gregory* here giveth, is too weake; for though *Chriſt* were not then come in the fleſh, yet his death was as effectuall to thoſe, that believed in him, then, as after his comming, as I have proved before. Neither is the gound or occaſion of theſe words of *Gregory* good; for hee buildes or comments upon that of *Job* 17.13. *If I waite, Sheol* (Hell, as *Gregory* underſtands it) *is mine houſe.* But I have ſhewed before, that *Sheol* doth not properly ſignifie Hell, as either wee, or our adverſaries uſually take the word, but the Grave, or the ſtate of the dead. And ſo the *Chaldie* Paraphraſt there for *Sheol* hath that which ſignifieth *the houſe of the Grave.* This appeares to be the meaning in that place by that which followes immediately after, *v.14. I have ſaid to corruption, Thou art my Father, to the Worme, thou art my Mother and Siſter.* If our adverſaries wil yet ſtand upon the authority of *Gregory*, I anſwer, that we are not tied to the authority of any in this kinde, further then they concur with the Scripture: and if we were, yet *Auſtines* authority were to be preferred, as being 200 years more antient then *Gregory*; but of this point enough.

כי קבורתא

Page 73. From *Limbus Patrum* wee muſt now paſſe to *Purgatory*, to which the Marqueſſe doth next leade us. *We hold* (ſaith hee) *Purgatory fire, where ſatisfaction ſhall be made for ſinnes after death: you deny it. We have Scripture for it,* 1 Cor. 3.13,15. *The fire ſhall try every mans worke, of what ſort it is; if any mans worke ſhall be burnt, hee ſhall ſuffer loſſe, but hee himſelfe ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire.* S. *Aug. ſo interprets this place upon* Pſal. 37. *alſo* S. *Ambroſe upon* 1 Cor. 3. *and ſer.* 20. *in* Pſal. 118. S. *Hier. l.* 2. *c.* 13. *adverſ. Joan.* S. *Greg. l.* 4. *dial. c.* 39. *Origen Hom.* 6. *in cap.* 15. *Exod.*

If there be any ſuch place as *Purgatory*, it doth much more concerne

concerne us then *Limbus Patrum*, which they hold to have been made void, and of no uſe long agoe, but this they pretend to continue ſtill, and to be of as much force as ever it was. But we finde nothing in Scripture to prove any ſuch place, or any ſuch fire, as that of *Purgatory*, wherein they that have not fully ſatisfied for their ſinnes in this life, muſt lie, and frie, untill they have made full ſatisfaction, and then be taken out, and conveyed to Heaven. For thereore they call the place *Purgatory*, and the fire *Purgatory fire*, becauſe (they ſay) in that place, by that fire the Soules are purged, which were not fully purged in this life, that being ſo purged, they may have entrance into Heaven. But how doth this agree with the Scripture? That tells us, that *the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt cleanſeth us from all ſinne*, 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. And that *if any man ſinne, wee have an advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous; And he is the propitiation for our ſinnes.* 1 *Joh.*2.1,2. It is onely Chriſt, who by his blood doth ſatisfie for our ſinnes, and ſo purge us from them; we cannot doe it by any thing, which we either doe or ſuffer in this life, much leſſe is it to be done by us hereafter when we are dead. God doth indeed afflict his children here in this World, thereby to purge them; *By this ſhall the iniquity of* Jacob *be purged, and this is all the fruit to take away his ſinne.* *Iſai.*27.9. But this affliction is onely *caſtigatory*, not *ſatisfactory*. *When we are judged, we are chaſtened of the Lord, that we ſhould not be condemned with the World.* 1 *Cor.*11.32. After this life is ended, there remaines no more affliction for the godly, for any thing that we can finde in Scripture. *Wee know, that if our earthly houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a building of God, a houſe not made with hands, eternall in the Heavens.*——*Therefore we are alwayes confident, knowing that whiles wee are at home in the body, wee are abſent from the Lord. For we walke by Faith, and not by ſight. We are confident, I ſay, willing rather to be abſent from the body, and to be preſent with the Lord.* 2 *Cor.*5.1,6,7,8. The Apoſtle ſpeakes there not peculiarly of himſelfe, or ſuch eminent ones as he was, but generally of all Believers, as appeares by thoſe words, *For we walke by faith, and not by ſight; Which*

Vocatur Purgatorium locus quidam, in quo tanquam in carcere poſt hanc vitam purgantur animæ, quæ in hac non plenè purgatæ fuerunt, ut nimirum ſic purgatæ in cælum ingredi valeant, quò nihil intrabit coinquinatum. *Bell. de Purgat. l.* 1. *c.* 1.

is as true of every believer, as it was of *Paul.* Now if the faithfull, when they depart out of this Tabernacle, the body, goe to their houſe prepared for them in Heaven, and are preſent with the Lord, and enjoy the ſight of him; then ſurely there is no ſuch thing as Purgatory, to keepe them, I know not how long abſent from God, in paine and torment. And ſo the Scripture tells us, that *they that die in the Lord, are bleſſed, and reſt from their labours. Revel.* 14. 13. But how are they bleſſed, and how doe they reſt from their labours, if yet after they are dead, they muſt endure Purgatory, the paines whereof, they ſay, are moſt grievous, and ſuch as that no paines here in this life are to be compared with them? Yea, ſome hold that the leaſt paine in Purgatory, is greater then the greateſt paine that is in this life. And whereas *Dominicus à Soto* thought that none did continue in Purgatory above ten years, *Bellarmine* confutes this by the cuſtome of their Church praying for thoſe that were known to be dead a hundred or two hundred yeares before. Which argues, that (as they ſuppoſe) ſoules may continue ſo long in Purgatory. Yea, he cites *Bede*, who lived about 900 years agoe, telling of one, to whom was ſhewed the paines of Purgatory, and it was told him, that all the Soules in Purgatory ſhould be delivered and ſaved in the day of judgement, &c. whence he infers, that according to *Bede* ſome now dead (yea that were dead many hundred years agoe) muſt abide in Purgatory untill the day of judgement. And will any call ſuch bleſſed? will any ſay that ſuch reſt from their labours? In a word, the Scripture tels us but of two places appointed for ſuch as depart out of this life, the one a place of comfort, and the other a place of torment; and withall it tells us, that betwixt theſe two places there is ſuch a great gulfe fixed, that they that are in the one, cannot paſſe unto the other. *Luke* 16. 25, 26.

Pænas Purgatorii eſſe atrociſſimas, & cum illis nullas pænas hujus vitæ comparandas docent conſtanter Patres. *Bell. de Purgat. lib.* 2. *cap.* 14.

B. Thomas dicit, minimam pænam Purgatorii eſſe majorem maximâ pænâ hujus vitæ. *Bell. Ibid.*

Repugnat Eccleſiæ conſuetudo, quæ anniverſaria ſacra celebrat pro defunctis, etiamſi conſtet eos ante centum vel ducentos annos eſſe mortuos. Quod certè non fieret, ſi Eccleſia crederet, non puniri animas ultra decem annos. *Bell. Ibid. cap.* 7. Scribit Beda l. 5. Hiſt. c. 15. cuidam oſtenſas fuiſſe Purgatorii pænas, dictumque illi eſſe, animas, quæ in Purgatorio degunt, ſalvandas omnes in die judicii, &c. ubi clarè indicat, aliquos jam defunctos uſque ad diem judicii manſuros. *Bell. Ibid.*

Neither

Neither doe wee want the teſtimonies of the antient Fathers for the aſſerting of this truth, which we maintaine. *Cyprian* ſaith, that though the godly and the wicked fare alike here, yet when this life is ended, then their eſtates doe much differ. *We are contained* (ſaith hee) *for a while both good and bad in one houſe; whatſoever doth happen within the houſe, we ſuffer alike, untill this temporall life being ended, we are divided to the habitations either of eternall death, or of immortality.* Hee makes no third place diſtinct from thoſe of immortality, and of everlaſting death; neither doth hee make any ſtay after the end of this life, but that ſuch as eſcape the habitation of endleſſe death, doe immediately paſſe to the habitation of immortality. So the ſame Father againe. *The Kingdome now is very neare at hand, &c. now after earthly things follow heavenly, after ſmall things great, after fading things eternall. What place is there here for anxiety and carefulneſſe? who can now be fearfull, and ſad, but he that hath neither hope, nor faith? For it is for him to feare death, who is not willing to goe to Chriſt: and it is for him to be unwilling to goe to Chriſt, who doth not believe that he beginnes to reigne with Chriſt. For it is written, that the juſt doth live by faith. If thou beeſt juſt, if thou doeſt live by faith, if thou doeſt indeed believe in God; why being to be with Chriſt, and being ſure of the Lords promiſe, doeſt thou not embrace this, that thou art called unto Chriſt; and reioyce that thou art freed from the Devill?* Thus in a time of mortality did *Cyprian* comfort and encourage Chriſtians againſt the feare of death. But how will all this conſiſt with Purgatory? How is the Kingdome of God ſo nigh at hand? how doe things heavenly and eternall ſucceede things earthly and fading, if after this life the ſoules of Chriſtians may continue many hundred years perhaps in

Quamdiù enim corpus hoc permanet, commune cum cæteris ſit neceſſe eſt, & corporalis conditio communis, nec ſeparari generi humano ab invicem datur, niſi iſtinc de ſeculo recedatur. Intra unam domum boni & mali interim continemur: quicquid intra domum evenerit, pari ſorte perpetimur; donec ævi temporalis fine completo, ad æternæ vel mortis, vel immortalitatis hoſpitia dividamur. *Cyprian. ad Demetrian.*

Regnum Dei, fratres dilectiſſimi, cæpit eſſe in proximo, &c jam terrenis cæleſtia, & magna parvis, & caducis æterna ſucceduant. Quishic anxietatis & ſollicitudinis locus? Quis inter hæc trepidus & mæſtus eſt, niſi cui ſpes & fides deeſt? ejus eſt enim mortem timere, qui ad Chriſtum nolit ire: ejus eſt ad Chriſtum nolle ire, qui ſe non credat cum Chriſto incipere regnare. Scriptum eſt enim, juſtum fide vivere. Si juſtus es, & fide vivis, ſi verè in Deum credis; cur non cum Chriſto futurus, & de Domini pollicitatione ſecurus, quod ad Chriſtum voceris, amplecteris, & quòd Diabolo careas, gratularis? *Cyprian. de Mortal.*

in the flames of Purgatory before they can get to Heaven? Might not this well make every one to feare death, and to tremble at the approach of it? Might not a Christian at his Death well cry out with the Heathen Emperour, *O poore Soule, whither art thou now going?*

O animula, vagula, blandula, Quæ nunc abibis in loca? *Adrian. Imperat.*

But * *Cyprian* goes on, and citing that of *Simeon, Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace; for mine eyes have seene thy salvation,* he addes, that *then the servants of God have peace, then they have free and calme quietnesse, when being taken out of the tempests of this world, we arrive at the haven of eternall rest and security, when as this death being past We come to immortality.* And so againe, *God doth promise immortality and eternity unto thee, when thou goest out of the world; and doest thou doubt? This is not at all to know God: this is to offend Christ the Lord and Master of believers, with the sinne of unbeliefe: this is to be in the Church, the house of Faith, and yet to have no Faith. How profitable it is to goe out of the World, Christ himselfe, the Master of our salvation and welfare doth shew, who when his Disciples were sorrowfull, because he said he was to leave them, said, If you had loved me, you would rejoyce because I goe to the Father,* (Joh.14.28.) *teaching us, that We should rather rejoyce then be sorry, when they depart out of the World, whom we love, Who are dear unto us.*

* Simeon denique ille justus, &c. Probans scil. atque contestans tunc esse servis Dei pacem, tunc liberam & tranquillam quietem, quando de istis mundi turbinibus extracti, sedis & securitatis æternæ portum petimus, quando expuncta hâc morte ad immortalitatem venimus. *Cypr. Ibid.*

Deus de hoc mundo recedenti tibi immortalitatem, atque æternitatem pollicetur, & tu dubitas? Hoc est Deum omninò non nosse; hoc est Christum credentium Dominum & magistrum peccato incredulitatis offendere; hoc est, in Ecclesiâ constitutum fidem in domo fidei non habere. Quantum profit exire de seculo, Christus ipse salutis atque utilitatis nostræ magister ostendit: qui cum discipuli ejus contristarentur, quòd se jam diceret recessurum, locutus est ad eos dicens, si me dilexissetis, gauderetis, quoniam vado ad Patrem: docens scil. & ostendens, cum chari, quos diligimus, de seculo exeunt, gaudendum potiùs quàm dolendum. *Cyprian. Ibid.*

Thus also *Hierome* writing to *Paula* to comfort her concerning the Death of her Daughter *Blæsilla*, saith, *Let the dead be lamented, but such an one whom the place of torment doth receive, whom Hell doth devoure, for whose punishment the everlasting fire doth burne*

Lugeatur mortuus, sed ille, quem gehenna suscipit, quem tartarus devorat, in cujus pœnam æternus ignis æstuat. Nos quorum exitum angelorum turba comitatur, quibus obviam Christus occurrit, gravamur magis, si diutius in Tabernaculo isto mortis

burne. We, whoſe departure a troupe of Angels doth accompany, whom Chriſt doth come to meet, are more grieved (or, as ſome reade *gravemur, let us be more grieved*) *if we abide longer in this Tabernacle of death: becauſe ſo long as we abide here, we are as pilgrimes abſent from the Lord. Let that deſire poſſeſſe us, woe is me, that my pilgrimage is prolonged, &c. Auſtine* plainly ſaith, that *the Catholike faith by Divine authority doth believe the firſt place to be the Kingdome of Heaven; the ſecond to be Hell, where every apoſtate, or ſuch as are aliens from the faith of Chriſt, doe ſuffer everlaſting puniſhments; a third place we are altogether ignorant of, yea we finde in the holy Scriptures, that there is no ſuch place. Bellarmine* anſwers that *Auſtine* there ſpeakes of thoſe places, which are everlaſting. Which indeed is true; for he ſpeakes of Heaven, and of Hell (the place of torment) which are everlaſting places for thoſe to abide in, that are in them. But withall hee ſaith that there is no third place, *viz.* for thoſe that depart out of this life. Beſides, how can the Romaniſts yeeld that there is no everlaſting place beſides Heaven, and Hell, *viz. Gehenna* (which is the word that *Auſtine* uſeth) the Hell of the damned? when as they hold a *Limbus infantium*, an everlaſting place for Infants to abide in, that die without Baptiſme: which place they make to be diſtinct both from Heaven, and from the place of torment. For there (they ſay) ſuch children as die unbaptized, ſuffer the puniſhment of loſſe, whereby the place differs from Heaven; but not the puniſhment of ſenſe, whereby it differs from the Hell of the damned. But * *Bellarmine* proves that *Auſtine*, or whoſoever was the Authour of the booke called *Hypognoſticon*, did not deny that there is a third place to abide in for a time after this life, becauſe

habitemus. Quia quamdiù hîc moramur, peregrinamur à Domino. Illa nos cupido teneat, Hei mihi, quia peregrinatio mea prolongata eſt, &c. *Hieron. Epiſt. 25.*

Primum locum fides Catholicorum Divinâ authoritate credit, regnum eſſe cælorum; ſecundum gehennam, ubi omnis apoſtata, vel in fide Chriſti alienus æterna ſupplicia experietur; tertium penitùs ignoramus, imò nec eſſe in Scripturis ſanctis invenimus. *Aug. in Hypogneſt, ultra medium.*

Loquitur de locis æternis. *Bell. de Purg. lib. 1. cap. 13.*

Pro pænâ ſolius damni æternâ eſt Limbus puerorum. *Bellar. de Purgat. l. 2. c. 6.*

* Quod autem non negaverit Aug. aut quicunque fuit auctor Hypognoſtici, tertium locum temporarium poſt hanc vitam, ex eo poteſt intelligi, quod fides Catholica docet præter cælum & infernum fuiſſe ante Chriſti paſſionem ſinum Abrahæ, ubi degebant animæ ſanctorum Patrum. *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 13.*

the Catholike faith doth teach, that beſides Heaven and Hell there was before Chriſts death *Abrahams boſome*, where the ſoules of the holy Fathers did abide. I anſwer, that *Abrahams boſome* was any ſuch *Limbus Patrum* as the Romaniſts imagine, was no part of *Auſtines* Creede, as I have ſhewed before out of *Auſtines* undoubted writings. And therefore *Eraſmus* (though *Bellarmine* unjuſtly carpe at him for it) might well write *Purgatory* in the margent over againſt thoſe words, *a third place we are altogether ignorant of*; ſignifying that Purgatory is a third place, of which the Catholike faith is ignorant. But what neede is there to alledge particular Fathers, when as the Biſhop of Rocheſter, who was beheaded in the reigne of *Henry* the Eighth for maintaining the Popes ſupremacy, in his booke againſt *Luther* (as hee is cited by *Polydore Vergill*, who was an agent here in *England* for the Pope in the time of *Henry* 8.) when as (I ſay) that Authour confeſſeth, that Purgatory is never or very ſeldome mentioned by the antient writers; and that the Grecians to this day doe not believe that there is any ſuch thing as Purgatory. Now for the place of Scripture, which the Marqueſſe ſaith they have for Purgatory, *viz.* 1 *Cor.* 3. 13, 15. Firſt it is to be obſerved, that whereas *Bellarmine* doth alledge diverſe other places beſides this for proofe of Purgatory, the Marqueſſe waves all the other, and mentiones onely this, conceiving it (as it ſeemes) more plaine and pregnant then the reſt. Yet, 2. *Bellarmine* tells us, and bids us marke it, that this is one of the moſt obſcure places of all the Scripture: though withall hee ſaith, it is one of the moſt uſefull places, becauſe from thence they have (as hee ſuppoſeth) a foundation both for Purgatory, and for veniall ſinnes. But (as hath beene obſerved before out of *Auſtine*) the Scripture is cleare in thoſe things, which concerne faith; and therefore we muſt not build

Ineptè igitur Eraſmus ponit in margine ad illa verba [tertium penitùs ignoramus] Purgatorium, q. d. Purgatorium eſt locus tertius, quem ignorat fides Catholica. *Bell. Ibid.*

Nemo certè dubitat Orthodoxus, an Purgatorium ſit, de quo tamen apud priſcos nulla, vel quàm rariſſima mentio: ſed & Græcis ad hunc uſque diem non eſt creditum eſſe. *Roffenſ. contra Luther. citat. à Polydor. Vergil. de Invent. l. 8. c. 1.*

Nota in primis, locum iſtum Apoſtoli, 1 Cor. 3. eſſe unum ex difficillimis, & utilliſimis totius Scripturæ. Nam ex eo ſtatuunt Catholici duo Eccleſiaſtica dogmata, purgatorium, & venialia peccata. *Bell. de Purgat. l. 1. c. 5.*

In iis quæ apertè poſita ſunt in Scripturis, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreſque vivendi. *Aug. de doct. Chriſt. l. 2. c. 9.*

build pointes of faith upon obſcure places. Now ſo obſcure is this place, *viz.* 1 *Cor.*3. 13, 15. that *Bellarmine* ſpendes a long Chapter meerely in the explication of it. And yet when all is done, nothing can be made of it for Purgatory. For *Bellarmine* confutes thoſe that thinke Purgatory to be meant by the fire mentioned, *v.*13. *The fire ſhall try every mans worke of what ſort it is:* and he proves, that the fire there mentioned, is the fire of Gods ſevere and juſt judgement, which is not a purging and afflicting, but a proving and examining fire. So that *Bellarmine* doth take away one halfe of the Marqueſſes quotation; and indeed the whole quotation. For though *Bellarmine* would have thoſe words *v.*15. *he himſelfe ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire,* to be underſtood of Purgatory; yet who ſeeth not, that it is abſurd to take the word *fire* otherwiſe there then *v.*13. And therefore *Eſtius* upon the place ſaith, that it is evident, that one and the ſame fire is meant in both Verſes. Which fire hee will have to be that, which ſhall burne up the World at the laſt day. So alſo *Bellarmine* notes ſome to underſtand it; as ſome of the tribulations of this life: and ſome of everlaſting fire. All theſe Expoſitions *Bellarmine* relates, and confutes, as juſtly he may, that being indeed the true Expoſition, which hee embraceth, but doth not extend farre enough, *viz.* that by fire is meant Gods Severe and juſt judgement, whereby the workes of all muſt be tried, as it were by fire; though the Apoſtle there ſpeake peculiarly of Miniſters, and of their Doctrine: and ſo as it were by fire ſhall they be ſaved, that adhere to the foundation Chriſt, though their workes be found like wood, hay and ſtubble, vaine and unprofitable, ſo that they ſuffer loſſe in that reſpect, as having no reward nor benefit of thoſe workes. Now whereas the Marqueſſe ſaith, that *Auſtine* interprets this place of Purgatory, in his commentary upon *Pſal.*37. I anſwer, it is true, *Auſtine* there doth cite or rather glance at this place, and expound it as meant *de emendatorio igne*, of a purging fire, and ſaith that this fire is more grievous then any thing that a man can ſuffer in this life.

Alii intelligunt de pœnis Purgatorii; ſed neque id rectè dici poteſt. *Bell. de Purgat. l.1. c 5.*

Supereſt igitur, ut dicamus hîc Apoſtolum loqui de igne ſeveri, & juſti judicii Dei, qui non eſt ignis purgans, vel affligens, ſed probans, & examinans. *Bell. Ibid.*

In primis apparet, ignē uno modo in hoc contextu accipi debere. *Eſt. ad 1 Cor.3. 13.*

Ignis conflagrationis.

Gravior tamen eſt ille ignis, quam quicquid poteſt homo pati in hâc vitâ. *Aug. in Pſ.37.*

the Catholike faith doth teach, that beſides Heaven and Hell there was before Chriſts death *Abrahams boſome*, where the ſoules of the holy Fathers did abide. I anſwer, that *Abrahams boſome* was any ſuch *Limbus Patrum* as the Romaniſts imagine, was no part of *Auſtines* Creede, as I have ſhewed before out of *Auſtines* undoubted writings. And therefore *Eraſmus* (though *Bellarmine* unjuſtly carpe at him for it) might well write *Purgatory* in the margent over againſt thoſe words, *a third place we are altogether ignorant of*; ſignifying that Purgatory is a third place, of which the Catholike faith is ignorant. But what neede is there to alledge particular Fathers, when as the Biſhop of Rocheſter, who was beheaded in the reigne of *Henry* the Eighth for maintaining the Popes ſupremacy, in his booke againſt *Luther* (as hee is cited by *Polydore Vergill*, who was an agent here in *England* for the Pope in the time of *Henry* 8.) when as (I ſay) that Authour confeſſeth, that Purgatory is never or very ſeldome mentioned by the antient writers; and that the Grecians to this day doe not believe that there is any ſuch thing as Purgatory. Now for the place of Scripture, which the Marqueſſe ſaith they have for Purgatory, *viz.* 1 *Cor.* 3. 13, 15. Firſt it is to be obſerved, that whereas *Bellarmine* doth alledge diverſe other places beſides this for proofe of Purgatory, the Marqueſſe waves all the other, and mentiones onely this, conceiving it (as it ſeemes) more plaine and pregnant then the reſt. Yet, 2. *Bellarmine* tells us, and bids us marke it, that this is one of the moſt obſcure places of all the Scripture: though withall hee ſaith, it is one of the moſt uſefull places, becauſe from thence they have (as hee ſuppoſeth) a foundation both for Purgatory, and for veniall ſinnes. But (as hath beene obſerved before out of *Auſtine*) the Scripture is cleare in thoſe things, which concerne faith; and therefore we muſt not build

Ineptè igitur Eraſmus ponit in margine ad illa verba [tertium penitùs ignoramus] Purgatorium, q. d. Purgatorium eſt locus tertius, quem ignorat fides Catholica. *Bell. Ibid.*

Nemo certè dubitat Orthodoxus, an Purgatorium ſit, de quo tamen apud priſcos nulla, vel quàm rariſſima mentio: ſed & Græcis ad hunc uſque diem non eſt creditum eſſe. *Roffenſ. contra Luther. citat. à Polydor. Vergil. de Invent. l.* 8. *c.* 1.

Nota in primis, locum iſtum Apoſtoli, 1 Cor. 3. eſſe unum ex difficillimis, & utilliimis totius Scripturæ. Nam ex eo ſtatuunt Catholici duo Eccleſiaſtica dogmata, purgatorium, & venialia peccata. *Bell. de Purgat. l.* 1. *c.* 5.

In iis quæ apertè poſita ſunt in Scripturis, inveniuntur illa omnia, quæ continent fidem moreſque vivendi. *Aug. de doct. Chriſt. l* 2. *c* 9.

build pointes of faith upon obſcure places. Now ſo obſcure is this place, *viz.* 1 *Cor.*3. 13, 15. that *Bellarmine* ſpendes a long Chapter meerely in the explication of it. And yet when all is done, nothing can be made of it for Purgatory. For *Bellarmine* confutes thoſe that thinke Purgatory to be meant by the fire mentioned, *v.*13. *The fire ſhall try every mans worke of what ſort it is:* and he proves, that the fire there mentioned, is the fire of Gods ſevere and juſt judgement, which is not a purging and afflicting, but a proving and examining fire. So that *Bellarmine* doth take away one halfe of the Marqueſſes quotation; and indeed the whole quotation. For though *Bellarmine* would have thoſe words *v.*15. *he himſelfe ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire,* to be underſtood of Purgatory; yet who ſeeth not, that it is abſurd to take the word *fire* otherwiſe there then *v.*13. And therefore *Eſtius* upon the place ſaith, that it is evident, that one and the ſame fire is meant in both Verſes. Which fire hee will have to be that, which ſhall burne up the World at the laſt day. So alſo *Bellarmine* notes ſome to underſtand it; as ſome of the tribulations of this life: and ſome of everlaſting fire. All theſe Expoſitions *Bellarmine* relates, and confutes, as juſtly he may, that being indeed the true Expoſition, which hee embraceth, but doth not extend farre enough, *viz.* that by fire is meant Gods Severe and juſt judgement, whereby the workes of all muſt be tried, as it were by fire; though the Apoſtle there ſpeake peculiarly of Miniſters, and of their Doctrine: and ſo as it were by fire ſhall they be ſaved, that adhere to the foundation Chriſt, though their workes be found like wood, hay and ſtubble, vaine and unprofitable, ſo that they ſuffer loſſe in that reſpect, as having no reward nor benefit of thoſe workes. Now whereas the Marqueſſe ſaith, that *Auſtine* interprets this place of Purgatory, in his commentary upon *Pſal.*37. I anſwer, it is true, *Auſtine* there doth cite or rather glance at this place, and expound it as meant *de emendatorio igne*, of a purging fire, and ſaith that this fire is more grievous then any thing that a man can ſuffer in this life.

Alii intelligunt de pœnis Purgatorii; ſed neque id rectè dici poteſt. *Bell. de Purgat. l.1. c 5.*

Supereſt igitur, ut dicamus hîc Apoſtolum loqui de igne ſeveri, & juſti judicii Dei, qui non eſt ignis purgans, vel affligens, ſed probans, & examinans. *Bell. Ibid.*

In primis apparet, ignē uno modo in hoc contextu accipi debere. *Eſt. ad 1 Cor.3. 13.*

Ignis conflagrationis.

Gravior tamen eſt ille ignis, quam quicquid poteſt homo pati in hâc vitâ. *Aug. in Pſ.37.*

Libri, qui inſcribuntur Hypognoſticon eruditi ſunt, & utiles, & vetuſti auctoris, ſed phraſin non habent Auguſtini, &c. *Bell. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.*

But beſides what hath beene cited before out of *Auſtine* (if *Hypognoſticon*, be his, which *Bellarmine* thinkes not, though hee ſaith, the work is learned and profitable, and done by ſome antient Authour) but beſides that, I ſay, *Auſtine* in his moſt elaborate peece, *de Civit. Dei*, handling this place of the Apoſtle, ſhewes himſelfe altogether unreſolved whether there be any Purgatory fire after this life is ended. *Whether* (ſaith he) *they finde the fire of tranſitory tribulation burning up thoſe ſecular affections, which yet do not bring damnation, there only (in the other World) or both there and here, or therefore here that they may not find them there, I do not gaineſay, becauſe perhaps it is true.*

Sive ibi tantùm, ſive & hic & ibi, ſive ideò hic ut non ibi, ſecularia, quamvis à damnatione venialia, concremantem ignem tranſitoriæ tribulationis inveniant, non redarguo, quia forſitan verum eſt. *Aug. de Civit. Dei l. 21, c. 26.*

Here we ſee *Auſtine* taking the point into conſideration, had no more then a *perhaps*, hee was farre from being aſſured of that which they call Purgatory. *Bellarmine* pointing at that place of *Auſtine*, but not citing the words, ſaith that *Auſtine* there doth onely doubt whether Purgatory fire be the ſame in ſubſtance with Hell-fire, of which it is ſaid, *Mat.* 25. *Depart into everlaſting fire.* But it was his policy to conceale *Auſtines* words; for all that have any view of them, muſt needs ſee, that he doubts whether there be any Purgatory fire in the World to come. So the ſame Father in his *Enchiridion*, (which it ſeemes, he wrote when he was old) ſpeakes as doubtfully as may be of Purgatory. *That there is ſome ſuch thing alſo after this life, is not incredible; and whether it be ſo, may be inquired. But whether it be found, or lie hid, that ſome faithfull ones are ſo much the later or the ſooner ſaved by a certaine Purgatory fire, by how much they did more or leſſe love theſe good things that periſh; yet not any ſuch, as of whom it is ſaid, that they ſhall not poſſeſſe Gods Kingdome.*

Solùm dubitat, an ignis Purgatorius ſit idem in ſubſtantiâ cum igne Gehennæ, de quo dicitur Mat. 25. Ite in ignem æternum. *Bell de Purgat. l. 1. c. 10.*

Tale aliquid etiam poſt hanc vitam fieri, incredibile non eſt; & utrùm ita ſit, quæri poteſt. Et ut inveniri, aut latere poſſit, nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium (quando magis minúſue bona pereuntia dilexerunt) tanto tardius citiuſque ſalvari: non tamen tales, de quibus dictum eſt, quod regnum Dei non poſſidebunt, &c. *Aug. Enchir. c. 69.*

Here

Here hee makes it a queſtion whether it be ſo, or no, and the moſt that hee ſaith is, That it is not incredible, which is farre from aſſerting it as a thing that ought to be believed. *Bellarmine* ſaith that *Auſtine* here only doubts, whether after this life ſoules be burnt with the fire of griefe for the loſſe of temporall things, as here they uſe to be when they are forced to want things, which they moſt deſire. But beſides that the words of *Auſtine* (which here alſo *Bellarmine* did prudently omit) doe plainly refuſe this gloſſe, there is no ſenſe at all (that I can ſee) in it. For how ſhould ſoules after this life grieve for the loſſe of temporall things? Is there any uſe of temporall things after this life is ended? How then ſhould *Auſtine* make it a queſtion, whether ſoules in the other World are grieved, and even burnt with griefe for the loſſe of theſe things, which could doe them no good, if they had them? But againe, in the preceding Chapter of the ſame Book *Auſtine* treating of this place, 1 *Cor.* 3. 13, 14, 15. ſaith, that the fire, which the Apoſtle ſpeaketh of, muſt ſo be underſtood, as that both paſſe through it, both he that upon the foundation buildes Gold, and Silver, and pretious ſtones, and hee that buildes wood, hay, and ſtubble; and this hee clearly proves by the words of the Apoſtle. Now this doth quite exclude Purgatory from being the fire there mentioned. For they will not have Purgatory to touch him that buildes Gold, and Silver, and pretious Stones, but onely him that buildes wood, and hay, and ſtubble. *Auſtine* therefore makes this fire that the Apoſtle writes of, to be tribulation, and ſaith, that a man is ſaid to be *ſaved, yet as it were by fire,* becauſe the loſſe of thoſe things, which hee loved, doth burne him with griefe, yet nor ſubvert, nor conſume him, becauſe he is ſtrongly fixed upon the foundation. And this may ſuffice for *Auſtines* teſtimony, which is objected againſt us. The next is *Ambroſe*, who indeed ſaith that the Apoſtle in thoſe words, *yet ſo as by fire,* doth ſhew that *ſuch a man ſhall be ſaved,*

Bell. ubi ſupra.

Ignis enim, de quo locutus eſt eo loco Apoſt. Paulus, talis debet intelligi, ut ambo per eum tranſeant, id eſt, & qui ædificat ſupra hoc fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretioſos, & qui ædificat ligna, fænum, ſtipulam. —eſt quidem ignis tentatio tribulationis.— Salvus eſt quidem, ſic tamen quaſi per ignem. Quia urit eum rerum dolor, quas dilexerat, amiſſarum, ſed non ſubvertit, neque conſumit, fundamenti ſtabilitate atque incorruptione munitum. *Aug. Enchir. cap. 68.*

Cum dicit, ſic tamen quaſi per ignem, oſtendit ſalvum illum quidem futurum, ſed pœnas ignis paſſurum, ut per ignem purgatus fiat ſalvus, & non ſicut perfidi æterno igne in perpetuum torqueantur. *Ambroſ. in 1 Cor. 3.*

yet ſo as that he ſhall ſuffer the paines of fire, that being purged by fire he may be ſaved, and not as they that are perfidious, be for ever tormented with everlaſting fire. Here hee interprets the Apoſtle indeed as ſpeaking of a Purgatory fire; but yet it doth not appeare that he meant it of a Purgatory after this life. For notwithſtanding any thing that I yet ſee to the contrary, hee may be underſtood of the fire of affliction, with which God doth purge his people here, that ſo they may not periſh hereafter, 1 *Cor.* 11.32. The ſame Authour (if yet the ſame; for many thinke that thoſe Commentaries upon *Paules* Epiſtles, are not *Ambroſes*, and that not without cauſe, as *Bellarmine* judgeth) in the other place that is pointed at, as by the Marqueſſe, ſo alſo by *Bellarmine, viz. Serm.* 20. in *Pſal.* 118. toucheth upon the words of the Apoſtle 1 *Cor.* 3. but how our adverſaries can gaine any thing by him, I cannot ſee. *Take heed* (ſaith hee) *thou doe not bring with thee wood, or ſtubble, which the fire may burne up, unto Gods judgement. Take heed leſt being approved in one or two things, thou bring that, which in more workes doth offend. If any ones worke ſhall be burnt, he ſhall ſuffer loſſe, yet he alſo may be ſaved by fire. Whence it is gathered, that the ſame man is in part ſaved, and in part condemned.* Here *Ambroſe* himſelfe ſufficiently ſhewes, that hee ſpeakes of the fire of Gods judgement, whereof hee makes expreſſe mention. Neither can he meane any ſuch Purgatory as our adverſaries plead for, ſeeing hee ſpeakes of that which ſhall befall a man at the laſt judgement; for immediately before hee brings in that of the Apoſtle 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. *We muſt all appeare before the judgement ſeate of Chriſt, &c.* and then addes that before cited, *Take heed thou bring not with thee unto Gods Judgement Wood, ſtubble, &c.* Now when the day of judgement commeth, then our adverſaries hold that Purgatory ceaſeth. *Bellarmine* notes this

Commentaria in Epiſtolas S. Pauli à multis non creduntur Ambroſii, nec ſine cauſâ. *Bellar. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſtic.*

Cave ligna, cave ſtipulam ad judicium Dei tecum deferas, quæ ignis exurat. Cave cum in uno aut duobus habeas quod probetur, in pluribus operibus deferas quod offendat. Si cujus opus arſerit, detrimentum patietur, poteſt tamen & ipſe per ignem ſalvari. Unde colligitur quia idem homo & ſalvatur ex parte, & condemnatur ex parte. *Ambroſ. in Pſal.* 118. *Serm.* 20.

Omnes oportet nos ante tribunal Chriſti aſſiſtere, &c. Cave ligna, &c. *Amb. Ibid.*

Primus error eſt Origenis, qui extendit tempora Purgatorii ultra diem Reſurrectionis. *Bell. de Purgat. lib.* 2. *cap.* 1.

this as an errour in *Origen*, that hee extends the time of Purgatory beyond the Resurrection. So much therefore for *Ambroſe*. After him is cited *Hierome lib.2. cap.13. adverſ. Joan.* I ſuppoſe it is meant of *John* Biſhop of Jeruſalem, to whom *Epiphanius* wrote an Epiſtle, admoniſhing him to beware of the errour of *Origen*, which (it ſeemes) hee ſuſpected him to be guilty of; this Epiſtle being written by *Ephiphanius* in Geeke, *Hierome* tranſlated into Latine, and ſo it is inſerted among the Epiſtles of *Hierome*, being the 60 Epiſtle. Then *Hierome* himſelfe wrote a long Epiſtle, which is the 61. to *Pammachius* about the errours of this *John* of Jeruſalem, which Epiſtle is divided into 16 Chapters. And after that another about the ſame ſubject to *Theophilus*, which containes but three Chapters. Therefore the Marqueſſe here muſt meane the Epiſtle to *Pammachius*, which yet *Chapt.* 13. hath nothing at all about Purgatory. *Bellarmine* cites nothing out of *Hierome* againſt *John* of Jeruſalem, but ſomething out of him againſt the Pelagians, *viz.* this, *If* Origen *ſay, that no reaſonable creatures ſhall be deſtroyed, and give repentance to the Devill, what is that to us, who ſay that the Devill, and his Angels, and all the wicked and ungodly do periſh for ever, and that Chriſtians, if they be prevented in ſin, ſhall be ſaved after puniſhment?* Here indeed *Hierome* ſeemes to make ſome Chriſtians after this life to ſuffer puniſhment, and yet to be ſaved. But if hee doe ſpeake of puniſhment to be endured after this life (which is not cleare and certaine, though, I confeſſe, it is probable by thoſe words, *if they be prevented in ſin*) yet he ſeemes withall to have held that ſome even after the day of judgement ſhall be puniſhed, yet ſo as to be ſaved, which *Bellarmine* (as I have ſhewed) noted as an errour in *Origen*; and therefore *Hierome* in this (as it ſeemes) following *Origen*, doth diſſent as well from Romaniſts as from Proteſtants.

Bell. de Purgat. l.1.c.10.

Si Origenes omnes rationabiles creaturas dicat non eſſe perdendas, & Diabolo tribuit pœnitentiam; quid ad nos, qui & Diabolum, & ſatellites ejus, omnéſque impios & prævaricatores dicimus perire perpetuò, & Chriſtianos, ſi in peccato præventi fuerint, ſalvandos eſſe poſt pœnas? *Hieron. adverſ. Pelag. l.1.c.9.*

Now that *Hierome* was of that opinion, may appeare by that which hee ſaith a little before in the ſame Chapter. *That which thou putteſt in the Chapter following* (ſaith

Illud verò, quod in ſequenti ponis capitulo, in die judicii iniquis & peccatoribus non parcendum, ſed æternis eos ignibus exurendos, ferre quis po-

he

teſt, & interdicere te miſericordiam Dei, & ante diem judicii de ſententiâ judicis judicare; ut ſi volverit iniquis & peccatoribus parcere, te præſcribente non poſſit? dicis enim, ſcriptum eſt in Pſal. 103. Deficiant peccatores à terrâ, & iniqui, ita ut non ſint—— Non dicit eos æternis ignibus exurendos, ſed à terrâ deficere, & iniquos eſſe ceſſare. Aliud enim eſt, ipſos à peccato, & iniquitate deſiſtere; & aliud ipſos perire imperpetuum, & æternis ignibus concremari. *Hieron. Ibid.*

he to his adverſary) *that the unjuſt and ſinners ſhall not be ſpared in the day of judgement, but ſhall be burnt with everlaſting fire; who can endure, that thou ſhouldeſt interdict Gods mercy, and before the day of judgement Judge of the Judges ſentence? For thou ſayeſt, that it is written in Pſal.* 103. *Let the ſinners faile from the Earth, and the unjuſt, that they be no more.——He doth not ſay, that they ſhall be burnt with everlaſting fire, but that they faile from the Earth, and ceaſe to be unjuſt. For it is one thing for them to ceaſe from ſin, and from iniquity; and another thing for them to periſh for ever, and to be burnt with everlaſting fire.* Hierome ſeemes not to be ſo cleare in the other words for this, that ſome are puniſhed after this life, and yet ſaved; as hee is in theſe words for this, that ſome ſhall be puniſhed after the day of judgement, ſo as thereby to ceaſe from ſinne and iniquity (to be purged from it) but not ſo as to periſh for ever and to be burnt with everlaſting fire. Our adverſaries therefore (ſo farre as I can ſee) muſt relinquiſh *Hieromes* teſtimony, who either ſaith nothing at all for them, or more then they would have. After *Hierome* is cited *Gregory lib. 4. dial. cap.* 39. It is true, *Gregory* there ſaith, that *for ſome light faults we are to believe that there is a Purgatory fire before the (laſt) judgement.* But marke 1. *Gregory* there immediately before cites many places of Scripture, as *Joh.* 12.35. *Iſai.*49.8. with 2 *Cor.*6.2. *Eccleſ.*9.10. by which places hee ſaith *it is certaine, that ſuch as every one is When he goeth out of this World, ſuch ſhall he be When he comes to Judgement.* See then if theſe places of Scripture be not more cleare againſt Purgatory, then that which hee after alledgeth, is for it. He alledgeth that *Mat.*12. where it is ſaid, that hee that ſinneth againſt the holy Ghoſt, *ſhall not forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the World to come.* From whence he gathers, that ſome ſinnes are forgiven in this World, and ſome in the World to come. But

De quibuſdam levibus culpis eſſe ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus eſt. *Greg dial. lib.* 4 *cap.* 39.

Ex quibus nimirum ſententiis conſtat, quia qualis hinc quiſque egreditur, talis in judicio præſentatur. *Greg. Ibid.*

In quâ ſententiâ datur intelligi, quaſdam culpas in hoc ſeculo, quaſdâ verò in futuro poſſe laxari. *Gregor. Ibid.*

But 1. how will this ſtand with that which he ſaid before? For if ſome ſinnes not forgiven in this world, may be forgiven in the world to come, how ſhall every one be found at the laſt judgement ſuch as hee is when he dieth? 2. The collection from that place of *Matthew*, is not good. For thoſe words, *neither in this World, nor in the World to come*, import neither more nor leſſe then *never*, as S. *Marke* expreſſeth it, *He that ſhall blaſpheme againſt the Holy Ghoſt, hath never forgiveneſſe. Mark.* 3. 29. *Theophylact* expounds it thus, *he ſhall not be forgiven neither in this World, nor in the World to come*, that is, hee ſhall be puniſhed both in this World, and in the World to come. And ſo alſo (as *Janſenius* confeſſeth) it is expounded by *Chryſoſtome*. Some obſerve that *neither in this World, nor in the World to come*, is a Hebraiſme for *never*. *Bellarmine* ſaith that this is falſe; but hee was not ſo converſant in the Jewiſh writings, as to be fit to give ſentence in this caſe. *Druſius*, who was better skill'd in that kinde, citeth the Scholiaſt upon *Ben Sira* ſaying thus, *They that are of an intemperate tongue, cannot be cured, neither in this World, nor in the World to come.* Beſides *Janſenius* ſaith that this Conduplication, *neither in this World, nor* &c. doth ſignifie that as this ſinne ſhall not be forgiven in this World, becauſe of the enormity of it; ſo much leſſe ſhall it be forgiven in the World to come, which is not a time of Grace, as this preſent World is. If it be not a time of grace, how then can ſinnes be pardoned in that World, which here were not pardoned? We grant, that ſinnes may be ſaid to be forgiven in the World to come, yet onely ſuch ſinnes as are forgiven in this World, the forgiveneſſe of which ſinnes ſhall be declared and made manifeſt in the day of judgement. *Bellarmine* himſelfe ſaith that every one is examined, and receiveth his ſentence when hee dieth, and then ſome begin to be puniſhed, and ſome to be rewarded: and

οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται, &c. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ, ἢ ἐκεῖ τιμωρηθήσεται. *Theophy. in* Mat. 11.

Janſen. concord. cap 49.

Druſ. Prov. claſſ. 2. l. 3. prov. 24.

Hâc conduplicatione ſignificatur, quod ſicut non remittetur hoc peccatum in præſenti ſeculo propter ſui enormitatem: ita multo minùs remittetur in futuro, quod non eſt ſeculum gratiæ, ſicut præſens: *Janſen. Concord. c.* 49.

Sicut ergò ſententia fertur in morte uniuſcujuſque, & tunc incipiunt aliqui puniri, aliqui præmiari; & tamen dicuntur hæc eadem fieri in noviſſimo judicio, quia tunc fient coram toto mundo manifeſtiſſimè, &c. ita & examen fieri poteſt in morte uniuſcujuſque privatim, & iterum poſteà in ultimo judicio publicè. *Bell. de Purg. l.* 1. *c.* 5.

yet nevertheleſſe *theſe things are ſaid to be done in the laſt Judgement, becauſe then they ſhall be done moſt manifeſtly before all the World to the greater honour of the godly, and the greater ſhame of the wicked.* Even ſo though ſinnes are forgiven in this World, or not at all, yet they are ſaid to be forgiven in the World to come, becauſe in the laſt judgement it ſhall be made manifeſt to all the World that they are forgiven. 3. *Gregory* grants a Purgatory after this life onely for ſome ſmall and light ſinnes, as idle talking, immoderate laughing, &c. But they of the Church of *Rome* doe now hold, that mortall ſinnes (as they call them) in reſpect of the puniſhment are ſometimes remitted not here in this World, but in the World to come. 4. *Gregory* in that ſame place ſaith that the fire which the Apoſtle ſpeakes of 1 *Cor.* 3. 13, 15. may be underſtood of the fire of tribulation, which is endured in this life. What doe our adverſaries now gaine by *Gregory*? Hee takes away one principall place, that they build upon for Purgatory: he alledgeth many places, from which by his own confeſſion ſo much is evinced as indeed cannot conſiſt with Purgatory: hee builds upon a place, which both in the judgement of other Fathers profeſſedly commenting upon it, and alſo by diverſe reaſons appeares to make nothing for Purgatory: and concerning that Purgatory, which he doth hold, he comes ſhort of the opinion of our adverſaries; all which things conſidered, they can get little by his teſtimony. The next and laſt Father objected againſt us is *Origen*, whoſe teſtimonie, if it were moſt cleare for a Purgatory after this life, yet it were of ſmall force, he being cenſured (as I have ſhewed before) by *Bellarmine* as erroneous in this point, holding that there ſhall be a Purgatory even after the day of judgement. Yet *Bellarmine* alſo thought good to make uſe of his teſtimony, *viz.* this, *He that is ſaved, is ſaved by fire; that if perhaps he have any lead mixed with him, the fire may melt and conſume it, that ſo all may be made pure Gold.* Thus I confeſſe, *Origen* writes in the place, which the Mar-

Sed tamen, ut prædixi, hoc de parvis minimiſque peccatis fieri poſſe credendum eſt, &c. *Greg. ubi ſupra.*

Peccata mortalia remittuntur in hoc ſeculo quoad culpam, & in alio interdum quoad pœnam. *Bell. de Purg. l. 1. c. 4.*

Quamvis hoc de igne tribulationis in hâc nobis vitâ adhibito poſſit intelligi, &c. *Greg. loc. citat.*

Qui ſalvus fit, per ignem ſalvus fit, ut ſi quid fortè de ſpecie plumbi habuerit admixtum, id ignis decoquat, & reſolvat ut efficiantur omnes aurum purum. *Orig. 6. hom. in Exod. 15.*

Marqueſſe citeth. And ſo alſo in the ſame place hee hath theſe words, which though *Bellarmine* doth not alledge, yet ſome have thought to make for Purgatory, and ſo they do as much as the other. *All muſt come to the fire, all muſt come to the Fornace.* Where in the margent it is noted (by *Genebrard*, I ſuppoſe, who was the overſeer of that Edition) that *Origen* ſpeakes of Purgatory. But it may eaſily appeare to any that looke into *Origen*, that neither in theſe words, nor in the other before cited, Purgatory is meant by that fire and fornace whith he ſpeakes of, but affliction. *As the fornace* (ſaith hee) *doth try Gold, ſo doth affliction the righteous.* And ſpeaking of *Peter* he ſaith, *He was not ſo great, nor ſuch an one, as that he had no mixture of lead in him. He had ſome, though but a little; and therefore the Lord ſaid unto him, Why didſt thou doubt, O thou of little faith?* And then immediately follow the words which *Bellarmine* alledgeth, and the Marqueſſe (I preſume) aimeth at, *Therefore he that is ſaved, is ſaved by fire, &c.* What is this to the Romiſh Purgatory? I am confident, they will not ſay, that *Peter* had neede of this Purgatory, yet hee had of that which *Origen* ſpeakes of, and ſo all whoſoever they be, it being affliction, by which here in this life even the beſt are tried and alſo purified. And thus much for Purgatory; in the laſt place comes extreme unction.

Veniendum eſt ergò omnibus ad ignem, veniendum eſt ad conflatorium. *Orig. Ibid.*

Interpretatur locum Pauli 1 Cor. 3. de Purgatorio, quod conflatorium vocat. *In marg.*

Sicut fornax probat aurum, ſic homines juſtos tentatio. *Orig. Ibid.*

Non enim tantus erat, ac talis (Petrus) qui nihil omninò de ſpecie plumbi in ſe haberet admixtum. Habuit licet parùm; propter quod dicit ad eum Dominus, Modicæ fidei, quare dubitaſti? Idcircò igitur qui ſalvus fit, &c. *Orig. Ibid.*

Laſtly, (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *We hold extreme Vnction to be a Sacrament: you neither hold it to be a Sacrament, neither do you practiſe it as a duty. We have Scripture for it*; Jam. 5. 14. *Is any ſick among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him in the Name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick, and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up; and if he have committed ſins, they ſhall be forgiven him. Neither any, nor all the Sacraments were, or could be more effectuall to mens good, nor more ſubſtantiall in matter, nor more exquiſite in forme, nor more punctuall in the deſignation of its Miniſtery: other* Page 73.

Sacraments being bounded within the limits of the ſoules onely good; this extends it ſelfe to the good both of ſoule and body. He ſhall recover from his ſickneſſe, and his ſinnes ſhall be forgiven him. And yet it is both left out in your practice, and acknowledgement. The Fathers are on our ſide; Orig. *hom.* 2. *in* Levit. Chryſ. *l.* 3. *de Sacerd.* Aug. *in Speculo, & Ser.* 215. *de temp. Vener.* Bed. *in* 6. Mar. *&* S. Iames; *and many others.*

Anſw. As for extreme Unction, as they call it, that is, the anointing of the ſick with oyl, as the manner is in the Church of *Rome*, Proteſtants do not acknowledge it to be either a Sacrament, or a duty, becauſe they ſee no ground in Scripture either for the one, or for the other. The Scripture indeed in two places, *viz.* that which the Marqueſſe citeth, and *Mar.* 6. 13. doth ſpeak of anointing the ſick with oyle: But that anointing was extraordinary, peculiar to thoſe times, when there was, as other extraordinary gifts beſtowed upon men, ſo, the gift of healing, which is mentioned, *Mat.* 10. 1, 8. and 1 *Cor.* 12. 9, 30. in which places of Scripture this gift is ranked with caſting out devills, ſpeaking with ſtrange tongues, and working of miracles. And ſo *Mark* 6. 13. It is ſaid of the Apoſtles, *They caſt out many devils, and anointed with oyle many that were ſick, and healed them.* It is plain, that this anointing with oyle was of like nature with caſting out of devils, that is, that it was a miraculous cure wrought by the Apoſtles. And that in Saint *James* was of the ſame kinde with this in Saint *Mark*, as I ſhall ſhew anon. But now the gift of healing in that manner being ceaſed, we ſay that the ceremony is to ceaſe alſo, and not to be uſed. The Marqueſſe inſiſteth much upon the words of Saint *James*, as being very clear and full to prove both that this anointing is a duty, and alſo that it is a Sacrament. And ſo the Romaniſts muſt hold, becauſe the Councell of Trent hath determined, that *the holy anointing of the ſick was inſtituted by Chriſt our Lord, as a Sacrament of the new Teſtament truly and properly ſo called*; and that *this Sacrament is inſinuated in* Mark, *but commended to the faithfull, and promulgated by* James *the Apoſtle, and the Lords brother.* And who ſoever ſhall gainſay this, the Councell doth pronounce

Inſtituta eſt ſacra hæc unctio infirmorum, tanquam verè, & propriè Sacramentum *N. T.* à Chriſto *D. N.* apud *Marc.* quidem inſinuatum, per *Jacob.* autem Apoſt. ac Domini fratrem fidelibus commendatum, ac promulgatum. *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* 14. *de inſtit. extr. Unct. cap.* 1.

Ibid. de extr. Unct. can. 1.

pronounce them accurſed. But there being two places of Scripture, which mention this anointing with oyle, it may ſeem ſtrange that the Marqueſſe ſhould alledge only the one, and wholly wave the other: wee ſhall ſee (I hope) by and by that this is as much as to quit both places, they being both to one and the ſame purpoſe. The Councell of *Trent* (we ſee) thought good to make uſe of both, yet ſo as to lay the more weight upon that in *James*, ſaying only that the Sacrament of anointing is inſinuated in the other. And ſo *Bellarmine* doth mainly build upon the words of *James*, yet ſo as that he will have the words of Saint *Mark* to contain in them a figure and adumbration of this Sacrament, which they call *extreme Unction*. Let us take what they grant, *viz.* that the anointing mentioned *Mar.6.* was not properly ſacramentall. So much the Marqueſſe tacitely doth acknowledge, and *Bellarmine* expreſly, citing for this opinion *Ruardus*, *Ianſenius*, *Dominicus à Soto*, and others, yea confirming it by diverſe arguments. 1. Becauſe that anointing, which the Apoſtles uſed, was referred onely or chiefly to the cure of the body, as is manifeſt by the words of Saint *Mark*; but Sacraments directly concern the ſoul, and the body only by accident. 2. The Apoſtles as then were not Prieſts; and therefore could not adminiſter Sacraments. Though they did baptize, yet (he ſaith) that is nothing, becauſe it is not ſo of the eſſence of Baptiſme, as it is of extreme Unction, that he ſhould be a Prieſt that doth adminiſter it. 3. The Apoſtles did promiſcuouſly anoint all that were diſeaſed, the blinde, and the lame, &c. but the Sacrament of Unction (they hold) is only for thoſe that lie ſick, and are like to die. 4. The Apoſtles did not enquire whether they whom they did anoint were baptized, or no, and it is altogether probable, that many were anointed by them, that were meer infidels. But neither extreme unction, nor any other Sacrament, (they ſay) belongs unto thoſe that are not baptized. By theſe reaſons *Bellarmine* proveth that the anoynting, which we read of *Mar. 6.* was not the Sacrament of extreme Unction. Now if this Sacrament be not meant in *Mar.6.* neither is it in *Iam* 5. For by the teſtimony both of antient writers, and alſo of modern Romaniſts, the anointing which Saint *Iames* ſpeaketh of, is the ſame with that which Saint *Mark* mentioneth.

Bell. de extr. Unct lib.1.cap.2

Bell. Ibid.

Hoc & Apoſtolos feciſſe in Evangelio legimus. *Bed.* ad illud *Iac.* 5. Ungentes eum, &c. ὅτι ἤλειφον ἐλαίῳ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, μόνος ὁ Μάρκος δέδηγεῖται, ὃ οὐ Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφόθεος ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ φησίν, ἀσθενεῖ τις, &c. *Theophyl.* ad *Mar.* 6. Ita etiam *Occumenius* ad *Iac.* 5.

Quod ſit eadem (Unctio) apparet ex *Theophylacto* & *Beda*, qui teſtantur hanc unctionem talem fuiſſe, qualis eſt ea, cujus meminit *Iacob.* in epiſt. ſuâ.— Ex quibus patet, hos ſenſiſſe Unctionem, cujus hic fit mentio, eandem fuiſſe cum eâ, cujus meminit *Iacobus*. *Ianſen. ad loc. Mar. in Concord. cap.* 55.

mentioneth. *Beda* upon the words of Saint *Iames, anointing him with oyle*, &c. doth parallel that place with the other, *Mar.* 6. ſaying, *We read in the Goſpel, that thus did the Apoſtles.* Thus alſo *Theophylact* upon the words of Saint *Mark* ſaith *That the Apoſtles anointed with oyle, only* Mark *doth relate; which alſo* Iames *the Lords brother doth ſay, Is any among you ſick, let him*, &c. *Ianſenius* confeſſeth that theſe Authours, *Beda* and *Theophylact*, doe teſtifie that the anointing ſpoken of *Mar.* 6. is ſuch as Saint *Iames* doth mention in his Epiſtle, and this he ſaith is evident by their words, which he citeth. *Bellarmine* doth attribute this opinion (*viz.* that the ſame anointing is meant both *Mar.* 6. and *Jam.* 5. to *Waldenſis*, and *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, two late writers (though one of them was a good while before *Luther*) both very zealous in defence of the Church of *Rome*; yet I confeſſe, that in *Alphonſus* where he ſpeaks of extreme Unction, I doe not find *Mar.* 6. mentioned. *Maldonate* upon *Mar.* 6. is moſt vehement for this, that the ſame anointing is ſpoken of there, and *Jam.* 5. and takes it very ill that any of their Authours ſhould hold otherwiſe, and ſhould ſay, and write, that the anointing which the Apoſtles uſed, was not ſacramentall for the healing of the ſoule, but rather medicinall for the curing of the body, and that the Sacrament of extreme Unction, is not treated of in (*Mar.* 6. *Where then* (ſaith he) *is this Sacrament, if it be not here?* Very good; yet *Bellarmine* by unanſwerable reaſons hath proved that no ſuch Sacrament is here, *viz. Mar.* 6. and therefore by *Maldonates* own inference it is no where, *viz.* in no place of Scripture to bee found. *Maldonate* objecteth, that the anointing *Mar.* 6.

Alphonſ. adverſ. hæreſ. de extr. Unct.

Vellem hoc loco ſoli mihi eſſent hæretici refellendi, liberius in ſolos incurrerem. Nunc autem nonnullos ex noſtris auctoribus in hæreticorum caſtris recognoſcens timeo, ne dum in hæreticos tela conjicio, aliquem fortè Catholicum feriam. Mitto illos paulo vetuſtiores, &c. Quid attinebat vigente nunc *Lutheranorum & Calvinianorum* hæreſi Catholicos doctoſque viros dicere, ſcriptiſque mandare, oleum illud ab Apoſtolis non tanquam Sacramentum ad ſanandos animos, ſed tanquam medicamentum ad curanda corpora, adhibitum fuiſſe, neque hîc de Sacramento, quo nunc Catholica utitur Eccleſia, extremæ Unctionis agi? ——Ubi ergo Sacramentum eſt, ſi hic non eſt? *Maldon. ad Mar.* 6.

Mar.6. could not be medicinall, becauſe it was uſed for the healing of all diſeaſes; and becauſe the Apoſtles were not to uſe medicines, ſeeing it was not Phyſick, but the Goſpel, which they profeſſed. But this is of no force; for they whom *Maldonate* oppoſeth, acknowledge that the oile, which the Apoſtles anointed with, did not naturally cure the diſeaſed, nor was uſed as a naturall medicine; and they prove it by *Maldonates* own argument, becauſe naturally one medicine cannot cure all diſeaſes. But they ſay, that by Chriſts inſtitution upon this anointing with oile, the ſick were healed. *Maldonate* would take away this anſwer, ſaying, that there was no need of any ſign, ſeeing that the cure which was wrought would work beliefe; and that the uſing of oil, would rather hinder faith; for that thereby people might think that the cure was wrought by the naturall vertue of the oile, and not by divine power. But the reaſon, which himſelfe alledgeth, would hold off people from any ſuch conceit, *viz.* becauſe they might ſee that all manner of diſeaſes were healed with one and the ſame oile, and that therefore it could not be by the naturall vertue of it. Beſides, that immediately upon the anointing with oile, the ſick were healed, whereas naturally ſome time would have been ſpent before the cure was wrought; Yet was not the anointing with oile ſuperfluous, no more then the laying on of hands, which was uſed both for the healing of the ſick, *Mar.* 16. 18. and alſo for the giving of the Holy Ghoſt, *Acts* 8. 17. though naturally that ceremony had as little vertue in that kinde as the other. Thus then whiles ſome of our adverſaries ſay, that extreme Unction is not that which Saint *Mark* treateth of; and others of them ſay, that Saint *Mark*, and Saint *Iames* doe both ſpeake of one and the ſame Unction, and that if extreme Unction be not ſpoken of *Mark.6.* we know not where to finde it in the Scripture; betwixt them both wee may ſafely conclude, that this Sacrament of

Si medicamentum tantùm erat, cur ad omne morborum genus adhibebatur? ——Deinde quorſum Apoſtoli medicamentis uſi fuiſſent? Non enim medicinam ſed Evangelium profitebantur, &c. *Ibid.*

Illud certum, quòd oleum hoc non naturaliter ſanabat ægrotos, nec adhibebatur ab Apoſtolis veluti naturale pharmacum. Nam quomodo eodem pharmaco quis mederi poſſit omnibus morbis? Sed ex Domini inſtitutione Unctionem hanc ſequebatur ſanitas, &c. *Ianſen. Concord. cap.* 55.

Quid ejuſmodi opus erat ſigno, quum ſecura ſtatim ſanitas fidem faceret? quam poterat quidem oleum non augere, ſed abrogare, &c. *Maldon. loc. cit.*

of theirs hath no firme foundation. But becauſe the Marqueſſe onely, and others mainly build upon the words of S. *James*, this is to be added, that Cardinall *Cajetane* in his Commentary upon *James* doth not only parallel him with *Marke*, but alſo doth both ſay and prove that he doth not ſpeake of the Sacrament of extreme unction. Becauſe 1. The Text doth not ſay, *Is any ſick unto death?* but abſolutely, *Is any ſick?* whereas extreme unction, as they uſe it in the Church of *Rome*, is onely for thoſe of whoſe life there is no hope. 2. The effect of S. *James* his anointing is the raiſing up (the bodily amendment) of the ſick; neither is any thing ſpoken but conditionally of the forgiveneſſe of ſinnes. Whereas extreme unction (as the forme of it doth ſhew) tends directly to the remiſſion of ſinnes. 3. *James* bids ſend for many Elders to one ſick perſon, both to pray for him, and to anoint him, which is different from the manner of extreme unction. Thus wee ſee how many of our adverſaries by conſequence, and ſome of them directly grant, that there is nothing in the Scripture for that extreme Unction, which they uſe, and maintaine to be a Sacrament.

Nec ex verbis, nec ex effectu verba hæc loquuntur de Sacramentali Unctione extremæ Unctionis; ſed magis de unctione, quam Dominus Jeſus inſtituit in Evangelio, à diſcipulis exercendam in ægrotis. Textus enim non dicit, infirmatur quis ad mortem, ſed abſolute, infirmatur quis? Et effectum dicit infirmi alleviationem: & de remiſſione peccatorum non niſi conditionaliter loquitur: quum extrema unctio non niſi prope articulum mortis detur, & directè (ut ejus forma ſonat) tendit ad remiſſionem peccatorum. Præter hoc quòd Jacobus ad unum ægrum multos Presbyteros tum orantes, tum ungentes, mandat vocari, quod ab extremæ Unctionis ritu alienum eſt *Cajet in Jac. 5.*

Now for the humane teſtimonies, which the Marqueſſe alledgeth, the firſt is *Origens*, who in the place mentioned hath nothing to the purpoſe. He cites indeed the words of S. *James*, which ſpeake of anointing with Oile, but it is not in reſpect of Unction, but in reſpect of Confeſſion of ſinne that hee doth cite them.

Cum non erubeſcit ſacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum ſuum, & quærere medicinam, &c. In quo impletur & illud, quod Apoſt. dicit, Si quis autem infirmatur, *Orig. Hom. 2. in Levit.*

After him is cited *Auſtine in Speculo*; but there being 33. Chapters of that Booke, which of them is meant, wee cannot tell. Neither is it much worth the inquiry; for *Eraſmus* ſhewes that Booke to be none of *Auſtines*, in that the Authour inſerts ſome verſes out of *Boetius*, who was long after *Auſtine*; Beſides other reaſons, which hee giveth; yet *Bellarmine* aſſerting *Auſtine* to be

Bell. de Scriptor. Eccleſ.

be the Authour of the Booke, takes no notice of the reasons alledged against it, though hee confesse that some doe doubt of it. In the other place of *Austine*, which is pointed at, I finde indeed, that hee doth cite the words of S. *James*, but yet so as that our adversaries gaine litle by it. For hee referreth those words of anointing with Oile, &c. unto bodily health; and so inveigheth against those that by Charmes, and Spels, and the like superstitious and ungodly practices bring upon themselves manifold miseries. Now bodily health is a thing, which the Romanists have no respect unto in their Unction, but use it directly for the good of the Soule, even as they doe Baptisme, and the Lords Supper. And this also takes off the testimony of *Chrysostome*, who shewing what benefit people have by Ministers, or (as hee calles them) Priests, saith that Parents cannot prevent so much as the bodily destruction of their children, nor keepe off a Disease when it seizeth on them; but these doe often preserve people alive, when they are even ready to die; and sometimes mitigate their paine; and sometimes keepe them from being ill at all, not onely by the helpe of their Doctrine, and admonition, but also of their prayers. And then hee cites that *Jam.* 5. *Is any sick among you? Let him send for the Elders, &c.* All this is nothing to the Romish Unction; for besides that *Chrysostome* doth not at all speake of Priests anointing, but of their teaching, admonishing, and praying, and in this respect doth bring in the words of S. *James*; besides this, I say, it is directly a corporall benefit, which hee insisteth on, as freedome from sickneſse, mitigation of paine, deliverance from Death; and therefore that which hee saith, makes nothing for extreme Unction, which they of the Church of *Rome* say, was instituted of God to this end, that wee departing out of this mortall life,

Infirmatur aliquis, inducat presbyteros, &c. Videte, fratres, quia qui in infirmitate ad Ecclesiam cucurrerit, & corporis sanitatem recipere, & peccatorum indulgentiam meebitur obtinere. Cum ergò duplicia bona possint in Ecclesiâ inveniri, quarè per præcantatores, per fontes, & arbores, & diabolica phylacteria, per characteres, & aruspices, & Divinos, vel fortilegos multiplicia sibi mala miseri homines conantur infetre? *Aug. Ser.* 215. *de temp.*

Parentes ne corporalem quidem interitum à liberis amoliri possunt, neque ingruentem morbum propulsare; cum hi (*sacerdotes*) laborantem, ac morti jam jam propinquam animam identidem servarint, aliis remissiorem pœnam infligentes, alios prorsus labi non permittentes, non Doctrinæ solùm, atque commonitionis, sed etiam precum subsidio. *Chrys l.* 3. *de sacerd.*

Ut ex hâc mortali vitâ decedentes, expeditiorem ad cælum viam haberemus, extremæ Unctionis Sacramentum (Deus) instituit. *Catechis. Trident.* Sacramentum exeuntium. *Ibid.*

life, may have a more ready way to Heaven. And therefore they call it *the Sacrament of such as goe out of this World.* What is this Sacrament then concerned in the words of *Chrysostome*, who speakes onely of preserving life and health here in this World? In the last place Venerable *Bede* is alledged. But 1. Hee is against them in this (as I have shewed before) that he makes *Marke* and *James* to speake both of one and the same thing; whereas diverse of them both say and prove, that *Marke* doth not speake of Sacramentall Unction. 2. By *Elders Bede* understandeth Elders in respect of age. And hee saith expressely, and alledgeth also Pope *Innocentius* for it, that not onely Presbyters, but also all Christians may use this Oile and anoint with it, when either they, or any belonging unto them have neede. Which is enough to prove that he doth not make this Unction a Sacrament, as they of the Church of *Rome* doe. For (saith *Bellarmine*) *it is of the essence of the Sacrament of extreme Unction, that the Minister of it be a Priest: and if a lay-man doe anoint any, it is of no force.* Yea the Councell of Trent sayes, *If any one shall say, that not only a Priest is the proper Minister of extreme Vnction, let him be anathema.* What doe they say to *Bede* then, and to *Innocentius* whom *Bede* citeth? They answer, that *Innocentius* and *Bede* speak not of him that is to administer the Unction, but of him that is to receive it. But this is a very violent and forced interpretation, and such as *Bedes* words will not admit. For hee having said, *It is the custome of the Church, that they that are weak should be anointed by Presbyters with consecrated Oile, and by Prayer accompanying it be made whole*: immediately after he adds, *Neither only Presbyters, but also (as Pope* Innocentius

Plurimorum se adjutorio, & hoc seniorum curare meminerit, neque ad juniores minusque doctos causam suæ imbecillitatis referat, &c. *Bed. in Jac. 5.*

Nec solum Presbyteris, sed ut Innocentius Papa scribit, etiam omnibus Christianis uti licet eodem oleo in suâ & suorum necessitate ungendo. *Bed. Ibid.*

Ut Minister sit sacerdos, est de essentiâ Unctionis——Non est rata Unctio, si laicus inungat. *Bell. de Extr. unct. l. 1. c. 2.*

Si quis dixerit proprium extremæ Unctionis ministrum non esse solum sacerdotem, anathema sit. *Concil. Trident. sess. 14. can. 4. de extrem. unct.*

Bellar. de Extr. Vnct. l. 1. c. 9. Jan. Concord. cap. 55.

Ecclesiæ consuetudo tenet, ut infirmi oleo consecrato ungantur à Presbyteris, & oratione comitante sanentur, Nec solùm Presbyteris, &c. *Bed. loc. cit.*

nocentius *writeth*) *all Christians may use this Oile by anointing with it either in their own, or in their friends necessity.* It is manifest, that *Bede* here speaketh of Christians using the Oile not so as to be anointed, but so as to anoint with it, and that both themselves and others, as they saw cause. 3. *Bede* also (as appeares by his words even now cited) makes this anointing with Oile, which (he saith) the Church did use in his time, to have reference to the body, and the health of it; neither doth he speak any thing of any spirituall effect, that it should have upon the soule. And thus also it appeares, that he doth not speake of the Sacrament of extreme Vnction. * *Cassander* also confesseth, that in the Church of *Rome* they have now departed from antiquity. 1. In this, that in more antient times they did not use (as now they do) to defer this anointing, untill life were even in extreme danger, and there was no hope of recovery. 2. In this, that antiently they used after this anointing, if there were danger, to receive the Sacrament of Christs Body and Blood; whereas now they have no such custome. Yea, the Catechisme of the Councell of Trent saith, that before extreme Vnction, the Sacrament of Penance and of the Eucharist is to be administred; and that this is the perpetuall custome of the Catholike Church; which is directly contrary to that which *Cassander* affirmeth. But this (I hope) may be enough to shew that the Romish Sacrament of extreme Vnction hath no support either from the Scriptures, or from the antient Fathers.

* Olim hæc unctio non, ut hodiè ferè fit, ad extremum usque vitæ periculum, & valetudinem jam deploratam differebatur, sed graviore aliquo morbo invadente hujusmodi orationes, & unctiones per septem aliquãdo dies continuabantur. Idẽ illud veteribus in more fuit, ut post officium unctionis, si periculum imminebat, corporis & sanguinis Dominici communicatio, quæ τελείη & perfectio omnium Sacramentorum habebatur, subjiceretur; à quo veteri more licet nonnihil hodiè variatum sit, &c. *Cassand. consult. artic.* 22. Servanda est Ecclesiæ Catholicæ perpetua consuetudo, ut ante extremam unctionem, Pœnitentiæ & Eucharistiæ Sacramentum administretur. *Catechis. Trident. de extrem. unct.*

The Marquesse having waded thorough all the forementioned parts of controversie, and (as he supposeth) proved the Scriptures to be on their side, now sings as it were an *Epinicion*, or a song of victory, saying, *Thus, most sacred Sir, we have no reason to wave the Scriptures Umpirage; so that you will hear it speak in the Mother language*, &c. Pag. 154.

But how litle the Scriptures Umpirage doth favour them of the Church of *Rome*, let the Reader judge by what hath *Answ.*

been ſaid on both ſides, the Scripture being underſtood in that ſenſe, which it ſelfe doth make out, and to which alſo the antient Fathers and Doctors have ſubſcribed, which (I ſuppoſe) the Marqueſſe doth mean by the Scriptures Mother-language. As for the Church of *Rome*, it hath long ſhewed it ſelfe the Scriptures ſtep-mother, keeping it ſhut up in an unknown tongue, or not permitting Chriſtians the liberty to make uſe of it, excepting ſuch as can obtain a ſpeciall diſpenſation for it; yea in many things going directly contrary to the Scripture, and even in a manner caſting off the authority of it. Here preſently after the Marqueſſe brings in the ſaying of *Auſtine*, *Evangelio non crederem, niſi me Eccleſiæ authoritas commoveret*, I ſhould not beleeve the Goſpel it ſelfe, unleſſe I were moved by the authority of the Church; as if, were it not for the authority of the Church, the Scripture were of no force, neither could deſerve any credit. So the Romaniſts do frequently pervert thoſe words of *Auſtine*; but *Auſtines* meaning was only this, that the Churches authority by way of introduction was a means to bring him to beleeve the Goſpel, by propounding and commending the Goſpel unto him, as a thing to be beleeved, whereas otherwiſe he ſhould not have given heed to it, nor taken notice of it; not as if he did finally reſt in the authority of the Church, and reſolve his faith into it. No; for (as I have ſhewed before) he would have the Church it ſelfe ſought in the Scripture, and proved by it. Had not the woman of *Samaria* told thoſe, among whom ſhe lived, of Chriſt, they had not come to the knowledge of him, much leſſe to beleeve in him; yet having heard Chriſt himſelfe, they did not reſt in the teſtimony of the woman, but ſaid unto her, *Now we beleeve not becauſe of thy ſaying; for we have heard him our ſelves, and know that this is indeed the Chriſt, and the Saviour of the World.* Joh. 4.42. So ſhould not the Church hold out unto us the Scriptures, we ſhould not know, much leſſe beleeve them; but at length (God by his Spirit opening our underſtandings that we may underſtand the Scriptures, *Luke* 24.45.) we come to be convinced by the Scriptures themſelves, that they are the Oracles of God, and of divine authority. *Melchior Canus*, a learned Writer of the Church of *Rome*, holds that the formall reaſon of our faith is not the authority of the

Cui & tertium ſubjiciendum eſt, rationem formalem noſtræ fidei non

the Church, that is, that the laſt reſolution of our faith is not into the Churches teſtimony. And he ſaith, that he could not diſſemble their errour, who hold that our faith is to be reduced thither, as to the utmoſt cauſe of beleeving. For the confuting of this errour, he ſaith belongs that *Joh.*4. *Now we beleeve not becauſe of thy ſaying, for we our ſelves have heard him, and know*, &c. The ſame authour averres, that *the authority of the Church is not a reaſon by it ſelfe moving to beleeve, but only a cauſe* (or meanes) *without which we ſhould not beleeve*, viz. Becauſe (as he addes) the Church doth propound unto us that the Scripture is the word of God, and except the Church did ſo propound it, we ſhould never (ordinarily) come to beleeve it; yet we doe not therefore beleeve the Scripture to be Gods word, becauſe the Church doth ſay it, but becauſe God doth reveal it. *If the Church* (ſaith he) *doth make way for us to know ſuch ſacred books, we muſt not therefore reſt there, but we muſt goe further, and muſt relye on Gods ſolid truth.* And then he brings in that very ſpeech of *Auſtine*, and ſhewes what he meant by it. *Hereby is underſtood* (ſaith he) *what* Auſtine *meant, when he ſaid, I ſhould not beleeve the Goſpell, except the authority of the Church did move me. And again, By the Catholikes I had beleeved the Goſpell. For* Auſtine *had to doe with the* Manichees, *who without diſpute would have a certain Goſpell of theirs beleeved, and ſo would eſtabliſh the faith of the* Manichees. Auſtine *therefore askes them what they would doe, if they did light upon a man, who did not beleeve ſo much as the Goſpell; what kind of*

eſſe Eccleſiæ auctoritatem, h. e. fidei ultimam reſolutionem non fieri in Eccleſiæ teſtimonium. —— Eorum hîc errorem diſſimulare non poſſum, qui aſſerunt, fidem noſtram eo, tanquam in ultimam credendi cauſam, reducendam eſſe. ——Huc enim pertinet illud *Ioannis* 4. Jam non propter tuam loquelam credimus: Ipſi enim audivimus, & ſcimus, &c. *Mel. Can. locor. Theol. lib.* 2. *cap* 8. Non eſt enim Eccleſiæ auctoritas ratio per ſe movens ad credendum, ſed cauſa ſine quâ non crederemus. *Can. Ibid.* Proponit enim Eccleſia, ut rem exempli causâ illuſtremus, Evangelium *Matthæi* eſſe à Deo revelatum, &c. Ego igitur non credo Evangeliſtam dicere verum, quia Eccleſiâ eum dicit verum dicere, ſed quia Deus revelavit. Et tamen Eccleſia proponens eſt cauſa ſine quâ ego non admitterem illud Evangelium eſſe *Matthæi. Ibid.* Nec ſi nobis aditum præbet ad hujuſmodi ſacros libros cognoſcendos, protinus ibi acquieſcendum eſt; ſed ultra oportet progredi, & ſolidâ Dei veritate niti. Quâ ex re intelligitur quid ſibi voluerit *Aug.* cum ait, Evangelio non crederem, niſi me moveret Eccleſiæ authoritas. Et rurſum, per Catholicos Evangelio credideram. Videlicet negotium *Auguſtino* erat cum *Manichæis*, qui abſque controverſiâ ſuo cuidam Evangelio credi volebant, & *Mani hæorum* fidem aſtruere. Rogat igitur *Aug.* ecquid facturi ſint, ſi in hominem incidant, qui nec Evangelio quidem credat, quóve genere perſuaſionis ſint eum in ſuam ſententiam adducturi. Credè ſe affirmat non aliter potuiſſe adduci, ut Evangelium amplecteretur, quàm Eccleſiæ auctoritate victum. Non itaque docet fundatam eſſe Evangelii fidem in Eccleſiæ auctoritate, ve-um ſimpli-

perſwaſion

citer nullam esse certam viam, quâ sive infideles, sive in fide novitii, ad sacros libros ingrediantur, nisi Ecclesiæ Catholicæ unum eundemque consensum. Id quod ejusdem Epistolæ cap. 4 & in lib. de util. credendi ad Honorat. satis ipse explicavit. *Can. Ibid.*

perswasion they would use to bring him to their opinion. He affirmes, that himself could not be otherwise brought to embrace the Gospell, but that the authority of the Church did overcome him. He doth not therefore teach, that the faith of the Gospell is grounded upon the Churches authority, but only that there is no certain way, whereby either infidels, or novices in the faith, may have entrance to the holy books, but one and the same consent of the Catholike Church. This he himself hath sufficiently explicated in the fourth Chapter of that Epistle, and in his book to Honoratus *concerning the benefit of beleeving.* I have thus largely cited the words of this learned Romanist, because no Protestant can speak more clearly, and more fully to the purpose. That which the Marquesse after addeth, is nothing against us, *viz. That there was a Church, before there was any Scripture; that though the Scripture be a light, yet we have need of some to guide us; though it be the food of our soules, yet there must be some to administer it unto us; though it be an antidote against the infection of the devill, yet it is not for every one to be a compounder of the ingredients; that though it be the onely sword and buckler to defend the Church from her Ghostly enemies, yet this doth not exclude the noble army of Martyrs, and the holy Church, which through all the world doth acknowledg Christ.* All this, I say, is nothing at all against us, who do so assert the authority of the Scripture, as that we doe not evacuate the Churches ministery. *Timothy* must preach; but it is the word (*viz.* of God contained in the Scriptures) which he must preach. 2 *Tim.* 4.2. *If any man speak* (for the instructing of others) *he must speak as the Oracles of God.* 1 Pet. 4. 11. He must confirm that, which he doth speak, by the Scriptures. And so on the other side they that hear, *must take heed how, and what they hear.* Luke 8. 18. Mark 4. 24. They must *not beleeve every Spirit, but must try the Spirits, whether they be of God.* 1 John 4.1. *They must to the Law, and to the Testimony; for that if any speak not according to this word, it is because they have no light in them.* Isai 8. 20. They must *search the Scriptures diligently, to see whether the things delivered unto them be so, or no.* Acts 17. 11.

THE

OF THE CHVRCH of ENGLAND.

THE SECOND PART OF THE Rejoynder *to the Marqueſs of* WORCESTER'S Reply *to His late* MAJESTIE'S Anſwer *to the ſaid Marqueſſe's* Plea *for the* ROMISH RELIGION.

THE Marqueſſe ſaith, that he will now conſider the Opinions of *Proteſtants* apart from them of the Church of *Rome*, and begin with the Church of *England*. The Religion of this Church, he ſaith, as it is in oppoſition to theirs, conſiſts wholly in denying, (for that what ſhe affirms, they affirm the ſame) as, the Real preſence, the Infallibility, Viſibility, Univerſality, and Unity of the Church, Confeſſion and Remiſſion of ſinnes, Free-will, Poſſibility of keeping the Commandments, &c. *And you may as well* (ſaith he) *deny the bleſſed Trinity (for we have no ſuch word in Scripture, only inference) as that which you have already denied, for which we have plain Scripture*, &c. Page 75.

But, 1. it is not altogether ſo, that what the Church of *England* doth affirm, the ſame they of the Church of *Rome* do affirm alſo. For the Church of *England*, Art 9. doth affirm (alledging Anſw.

(allcadging the authority of the Apoſtle for proof thereof) that Concupiſcence hath of it ſelf the nature of ſinne even in the regenerate, which the Romaniſts deny; the Councel of *Trent* accurſeth thoſe that hold this doctrine. 2. In what ſenſe we deny the Real preſence, and the other particulars here mentioned, I have ſhewed before; as alſo what little cauſe they have to boaſt, that either Scripture or Fathers do make for thoſe aſſertions of theirs wherein we diſſent from them.

Si qu's per Jeſu Chriſti D. N. gratiam, quæ in baptiſmate confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat, aut etiam aſſerit non tolli totum id, quod veram & propriam peccati rationem habet, ſed illud dicit radi tantum, aut non imputari; anathema ſit, &c. *Concil. Trident. de orig. peccat.*

Page 75. That which the Marqueſſe after addeth of a Womans being head, ſupreme, or moderatrix in the Church, I have likewiſe ſpoken to ſufficiently before.

That a Lay-man ſhould excommunicate, and that upon every ordinary occaſion, as non-payment of Fees, and the like, for which the Marqueſſe taxeth this Church, I am content that it paſſe among the *Errata's* of our Church, as he was pleaſed to ſpeak (though without cauſe) concerning ſome paſſages in the Fathers, as I have noted before. It is our Doctrine, and not our Diſcipline, that I endeavour to defend.

Page 76. After the Church of *England*, the Marqueſſe commeth to the Church of *Saxony*, and ſo paſſeth to the Church of *Geneva*, as he pretendeth; but yet indeed he ſpeaketh only of two particular perſons relating to thoſe Churches, viz. *Luther* and *Calvin*, as if whatſoever were held by them, were to be imputed to thoſe Churches to which they did relate: which ſurely is not fair dealing; much leſſe, that all Proteſtants ſhould ſtand charged with all their ſayings, were they indeed ſuch as the miſconſtruction of adverſaries would make them. We honour theſe, and many more, as men eminently active in that great work of reforming the Church; yet do we not aſcribe an infallibility unto them, as the Romaniſts do unto their Popes: We do not ſay of them, as *Bellarmine* doth of the Pope, that if they ſhould command vices, and forbid vertues, we were bound to believe vices to be good, and vertues to be evil. No, we know the Apoſtle bids us

Bell. de Pontif. lib. 4. cap. 5.

prove

prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. 1 Theſſ. 5. 21.

But let us ſee what it is that the Marqueſſe doth ſay, and firſt of *Luther*. *Of* Luther's *Doctrine.*

1. He chargeth *Luther* as ſaying of the book of *Eccleſiaſtes*, That *it hath never a perfect ſentence in it, and that the Author thereof had neither boots nor ſpurs, but rid upon a long ſtick, or in begging ſhooes, as he did when he was a Friar.* *Pag.* 76. *Obj.*

The places which the Marqueſſe citeth for proof of this, I cannot examine, they not being in *Luthers* Works, of that Edition at leaſt, which I have liberty to peruſe. But therein I find that *Luther* doth comment upon the book of *Eccleſiaſtes*, and doth ſpeak after a far other manner of it, ſaying, that *it is a Book worthy that all ſhould be much verſed in it; and that all, and eſpecially Magiſtrates, ſhould be well acquainted with it.* *Anſw.*

Is liber multis nominibus dignus, qui omnium manibus tereretur, ac quibuſvis, tum vel maxime reipublicæ procuratoribus notiſſimus eſſet. *Luth. tom. 4. præfat. in Eccleſ.*

2. He taxeth *Luther* for ſaying of the book of *Job*, That *the argument thereof is a meer fiction, invented only for the ſetting down of a true and lively example of patience.* *Obj.*

If *Luther* did ſay thus (which is more alſo then I can find) though I am far from being of his mind; for I ſuppoſe, that if there had not indeed been ſuch a man as *Job* in the hiſtory of him is deſcribed, the Prophet *Ezekiel*, and S. *James* would not have mentioned him as they do, *Ezek.* 14. 14, 20. *Jam.* 5. 11. Yet that moſt famous Doctor amongſt the Jewes, *Moſes Maimonides*, ſhewes that ſome were of this opinion, that there never was ſuch a man as *Job*, and that the hiſtory of him is but a parable. And this opinion himſelf inclines unto, though (I confeſſe) his reaſon is of ſmall force, *viz.* becauſe they that hold otherwiſe, cannot agree about the time in which *Job* lived. *Anſw.*

Noſti quoſdam eſſe, qui dicunt, Jobum nunquam fuiſſe, neque creatum eſſe; ſed hiſtoriam illius nihil aliud eſſe quam parabolam: quæ incertitudo (temporis in quo vixit Job) ſententiam illorum confirmat, qui dicunt illum nec fuiſſe, nec creatum eſſe. *Maimen. More Nob. par.* 3. *cap.* 22.

3. *Luther* (as is alleadged againſt him) ſaith, That *it is a falſe opinion, and to be aboliſhed, that there are four Goſpels; and that the Goſpel of S.* John *is only true.* *Obj.*

Neither can I find any ſuch thing as this in *Luther*, that *Anſw.*

the Goſpels written by the other three Evangeliſts, *Matthew*, *Marke*, and *Luke*, are not as true as that written by *John*. But I finde that which doth ſufficiently evince the contrary, *viz.* that *Luther* in the fifth volume of his Works, hath Annotations upon the firſt ſeventeen Chapters of St. *Matthews* Goſpel; and that in his Notes upon the firſt Chapter, he divers times calls both *Matthew* and *Luke* Evangeliſts, or publiſhers of the Goſpel.

Obj. 4. *Luther* (as the Marqueſſe alledgeth) ſaith of the Epiſtle of S. *James*, That it is *contentious, ſwelling, dry, ſtrawy, and unworthy an Apoſtolical ſpirit.*

Anſw. Thus alſo divers other Romaniſts have charged *Luther*, as *Campian*, *Duræus*, *Breerley*, and *Silveſter Petraſancta*; yet the words which they mention are not to be found in *Luthers* works. But (ſay the Romaniſts) they were in them, though afterward they were left out. I anſwer, Then, it ſeems if there were any ſuch words, they were not approved. *Duræus* confeſſeth that thoſe words are not in *Luthers* works ſet forth either at *Wittemberge*, or at *Strasburge*, but onely in thoſe ſet forth at *Jena*; which argues that if there were any ſuch words, they found but little approbation. Mr. *Breerley* ſaith, that the later Editions of *Luthers* works at *Wittemberge* were corrupted by the *Zuinglians* and others. But ſurely if *Luthers* Works were corrupted, and that in the Editions of *Wittemberge*, it muſt be by others, and not by the *Zuinglians*. For is it likely, that the *Zuinglians*, who were ſuch adverſaries unto *Luther*, that Mr. *Breerly*, and after him the Marqueſſe doth frequently alledge them againſt *Luther*, is it likely (I ſay) that they ſhould corrupt *Luthers* Works in that kinde, ſo as indeed to purge them from that which was amiſſe in them? And if they would do *Luther* this favour, yet how ſhould they do it at *Wittemberge*, where (I ſuppoſe) not the *Zuinglians*, but the *Lutherans* did bear ſway, and would have the chief hand in ſetting forth *Luthers* Works in that place? And

Camp. ſat. 1. Dur. contra Whit. Breer. Apol. Silv. contra Epi. Molin.

Tibi vero Whitakere ignoſco, qui exemplaria Wittembergæ tantùm, vel Argentorati excuſa legeris. Nam ſi quæ Jenæ olim edita fuerunt, vidiſſes, &c. *Dur. contra whitak. fol. 8.*

And concerning the Epiſtle of St. James, Luther, not in the latter editions of Wittemberge corrupted by the Zuinglians, and others, &c. *Breerl. Apol. Tract. 2. ch. 2. ſect. 10. ſubdiviſ. 2.*

And for that first Edition of *Luthers* Works at *Jena*, though (it seems) *Luther* did speak lesse honorably of St. *James* his Epistle, as I confesse I find him to speak elsewhere in his Works, yet not so basely as his adversaries of *Rome* do charge him. *Gerhard*, a great *Lutheran*, saith that *Luther* indeed in his Preface to S. *James* his Epistle, in the first Edition of the *German* Bible, did say that this Epistle is not of like worth with the Epistles of *Paul* and *Peter*, and that it is strawie, if it be compared with those Epistles. But that he no where tearms it *contentious*, *swelling*, *dry*; nor yet simply, but onely comparatively *strawie*. And that after the year 1526. in no Edition of *Luthers* Works it is so called, but the contrary rather is to be found, to wit, that *Luther* did commend this Epistle (though some of the Ancients did reject it) and account it good and profitable. It seems then, that *Luther* himself did retract that, which hee had written concerning the Epistle of S. *James*, his censure of it having been too bad, though yet not so bad as the Romanists would make it: And although this doth not justifie *Luther* (as I do not desire to defend him, or any man in that wherein he is to be condemned) yet it might make his opposers the more mild, that *Eusebius* and *Hierome* of old do shew, that the authority of this Epistle was some while doubted of; and Cardinal *Cajetane*, *Luthers* contemporarie, did somewhat scruple at it; and so did he also argue against the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Some also say, that *Erasmus* censures this Epistle of *James*, as not savouring of Apostolical authority. But in that Edition which I have of *Erasmus* his notes upon the New Testament, I finde no such censure,

Atque inde etiam facilè discitur, Epistolam Jacobi nomine inscriptam, haud quaquam Apostolicam esse Epistolam. Nullum enim propè elementum in eâ de his rebus legis. *Luth. tom. 5. in 1. Pet. 1.*

Sanè in primâ Bibliorum Germanicorum Editione in Præfat. Epist. Jacobi scribit, eam non posse dignitate certare cum Epistolis Petri & Pauli, sed Epistolam strammeam esse, si cum illis comparetur. Sed 1. Nuspiam vocat contentiosam, tumidam, aridam. 2. Aliud est loqui ἁπλῶς, aliud συγκεκριμένως. 3. In posterioribus Bibliorum Editionibus verba illa sunt omissa. Post annum 1526. in nullâ Bibliorum Editione straminea à Luthero vocatur. 4. Contrarium potius in posterioribus illis Editionibus habetur, videl. quòd eam quamvis à veteribus rejecta, tamen laudet, ac pro utili ac commodâ habebat. *Gerh. de S. Script. sect. 279.*

Euseb. hist. l. 2. c. 23. & l. 3. c. 22.

Hieron. in Cata. Scriptor. Ecclesiastic.

Cajet. in Jac. 1. 1. & in Heb. 1.

Whit. contra Camp.

Verùm supervacuum arbitror amplè de autore digladiari; rem potiùs amplectamur, & Spiritum S. autorem exosculemur. *Eras. in Jac. 1. 1.*

but that he would not have us contend about the * Author, but to imbrace the matter, acknowledging the Holy Ghost to be the Author of it. This advice is worthy to be followed by Protestants as well as Papists.

* Whether it were the Apostle *James*, or some other.

Obj. 5. *Luther* is taxed for saying, That *Moses in his writings sheweth unpleasant, stopped and angry lips, in which the word of grace is not, but of wrath, death and sinne.* And that hee calls him a *Gaoler, executioner, and a cruel Serjeant.*

Answ. This doth Mr. *Breerley* object against *Luther*, and I grant that *Luther* indeed hath those words, *tom.3. in Psal.* 45. But he speaks of *Moses* onely as contradistinct to Christ, as a meer Law-giver. *For the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ*, Joh.1.17. So *Moses* his ministration was *the ministration of death*, 2 Cor.3.7. and *the ministration of condemnation*, v. 9. The Law simply considered, doth convince of sinne, and condemn for sinne. *For by the Law is the knowledge of sinne*, Rom.3.20. And it saith, *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the Law to do them*, Gal.3.10. Now no man doth, or can perform this, and therefore (saith the Apostle there) *as many as are of the works of the Law, are under the curse.* And so *the Law worketh wrath*, Rom.4.15. This is not through any fault of the Law, but by reason of sinne, *which is a transgression of the Law*, 1 Joh.3.4. and so makes liable to the curse and condemnation, which by the Law belongs to those that transgresse. *The Law* (saith *Ambrose*) *is not wrath, but it worketh wrath, that is, punishment to him that sinneth, in that it doth not pardon sin, but revenge it.* And again, *The glory of Moses his countenance* (saith he) *had not the fruit of glory, in that it did not profit any, but rather hurt, though not through its own fault, but through the fault of those that sinne.* This is spoken of the Law, as it stands in opposition to the Gospel, wherein reconciliation and salvation through Christ is set forth. And in this sense only did *Luther* speak of *Moses*, as himself expressly sheweth. 6.The

Breerl. ubi sup.

Non ergo lex ira est, sed iram operatur peccati, id est, pœnam, dum non ignoscit sed vindicat. *Ambros. in Rom.*3 Quando enim nulli proficit gloria vultus ejus (sc. *Mosis*) non habuit fructum gloriæ, sed magis obfuit; licet non suo vitio, sed peccantium. *Ambros. in* 2 *Cor.*3.

Per totum Psalmum facienda est antitheſis Mosi seu legis cum Evangelio. *Luth. ubi supra.*

6. The Marqueſſe addes, that *for* Luther's *doctrine, he holds a threefold Divinity, or three kinds, as there are three Perſons.* *Obj.*

For proof of this, only *Zuinglius* is cited. But *Luther* and he being ſuch adverſaries, their teſtimonies one againſt the other are of ſmall force. Had any ſuch thing been in *Luthers* writings, the Romaniſts themſelves (I doubt not) would have found it out, and not have referred us only to *Zuinglius* for it. *Luther* on *Geneſ.* 1. doth expreſſely ſpeak of three Perſons, but one Divinity, as being the ſame in all the three Perſons. *Anſw.*

Sancti Patres (præſertim Auguſtinus *l.*11.*de civ.Dei,c.*24.) obſervant, quòd Moſes his tribus verbis utitur, Deus dixit,fecit, vidit, quaſi hoc modo tres Divinitatis Perſonas voluerit oſtendere. *Luth. in Gen.*1.

7. That *Luther is angry with the word Trinity, calling it a humane invention, and a thing that ſoundeth very coldly.* *Obj.*

The place alledged I have not opportunity to examine: but thus much I ſay, that *Luther* believing the thing, *viz.* that there are three Divine Perſons, (as I have ſhewed immediately before) I ſee not why he ſhould diſlike the word *Trinity.* *Anſw.*

8. That *he juſtifies the* Arrians, *and ſaith, they did very well in expelling the word* (Homouſion) *being a word that his ſoule hated.* *Obj.*

Thus alſo *Duræus*, and before him *Campian*, and before them both *Bellarmine* chargeth *Luther* with ſaying, that his ſoule did hate the word *Homouſion*, which the Orthodox Fathers uſed, to ſhew againſt the *Arrians* the conſubſtantiality of the Son with the Father. But they wrong *Luther*, as their manner is: For he doth not ſay, that his ſoul did hate that word; but that if his ſoul did hate it, and he would not uſe it, yet he ſhould not be a heretick, ſo that he did hold the thing ſignified by the word, which the Fathers in the *Nicene* Councel did determine by the Scriptures. He ſpeaks thus in reſpect of the Papiſts, who will not be content with Scripture-terms, but will invent terms of their own to pervert the ſenſe of Scriptures. As *Latomus* (againſt whom he writes) would not call Concupiſcence ſinne, as the *Anſw.*

*Dur. defenſ. Camp. Camp.rat.*8. *Bell. præfat. diſp. de Chriſt.*

Quòd ſi odit anima mea vocem *Homouſion*, & nolim eâ uti, non ero hæreticus. Quis enim me cogit uti, modo rem teneam, quæ in concilio per Scripturas definita eſt. *Luth.cont. Latom.*

Paulus præcipit, ut vitares profanas vocum novitates, & loquereris ut ipſe loquitur, & ſacris vocum antiquitatibus inhæreres. *Luth. contra Latom.*

Nec eſt quòd mihi homouſion illud objectes, adverſus Arrianos receptum. Non fuit receptum à multis, iiſque præclariſſimis, quod & Hieronymus optavit aboleri, &c. —— Etſi Arriani malè ſenſerunt in fide, hoc tamen optimè, ſive malo, ſive bono animo exegerunt, ne vocem profanam, & novam in regulis fidei uſurpare liceret. Scripturæ enim ſinceritas cuſtodienda eſt, nec præſumat homo ore ſuo loqui aut clariùs, aut ſincerius, quam Deus elocutus eſt ore ſuo. *Luth. ibid.*

the Apoſtle cals it, but a puniſhment of ſinne. Hereupon *Luther* (I think) went too far concerning the word *Homouſion*, though not ſo far as his Romiſh adverſaries do charge him. He ſaith that this word uſed in confutation of the *Arrians* is not to be objected againſt him: For that many, and thoſe moſt excellent men did not receive it, and that *Hierome* wiſhed it were aboliſhed. And that although the *Arrians* did erre in the faith, yet they did well however to require, that a profane and new word might not be uſed in rules of faith: For that the ſincerity of Scripture is to be preſerved, and man is not to preſume to ſpeak either more clearly, or more ſincerely then God hath ſpoken. I confeſſe that *Luther* in this ſeemeth to me to exceed, as men are apt to do in favour of that cauſe which they proſecute. But yet it appears that he was ſound in the faith, and did not comply with the *Arrians*, who oppoſed the word *Homouſion*, not ſo much for the new invention, as for the ſignification of it.

Breerl. Apol. tract. 2. ch. 2. ſect. 10. ſubdiviſ. 13.

Mr. *Breerly*, who hath alſo this charge againſt *Luther*, (as indeed he hath moſt of that which the Marqueſſe objecteth againſt Proteſtant Divines) cites *Luther* againſt *Latomus*, in the Edition of *Wittembergh* 1551. and ſaith, that the latter Editions are altered and corrupted by *Luthers* Scholars, as he had ſhewed (he ſaith) the like before, *viz.* concerning that place, where *Luther* (they ſay) did ſpeak ſo reprochfully of S. *James* his Epiſtle. But, 1. This is not like the other: For here he ſaith, *Luthers* works were altered by his Scholars; but there he ſaith, they were altered by his adverſaries. 2. As I have ſhewed the other to be improbable, ſo alſo is this. For *Luther* died *anno* 1546. ſo that the Edition which was *anno* 1551. was five years after *Luthers* death; and ſurely by that time *Luthers* Scholars had leiſure enough to make ſuch an alteration, as Mr. *Breerly* ſpeaks of, in *Luthers* works,

Sleidan. comment. lib. 16.

if

if they had been ſo minded. I cannot therefore but take this as a trick of Mr. *Breerley's*, when he ſaw *Campians* quotation of *Luther* confuted by Dr. *Whitaker*, to pretend ſome former Edition of *Luthers* Works, as having it ſo as *Campian* alleadged. And this is the more apparent, in that *Dureus* profeſſedly taking upon him the defence of *Campian* againſt Dr. *Whitaker*, never ſo much as takes notice of that which the Doctor ſaith againſt *Campian* for falſifying the words of *Luther*, ſo far was he from knowing of that pretended Edition *anno* 1551. which ſhould have it (forſooth) juſt ſo as *Campian* quoted it.

9. *Luther* (as the Marqueſſe telleth us) *affirmed, that Chriſt was from all eternity, even according to his humane nature.* For proof hereof onely *Zuinglius* is cited. *Obj.*

But (as I noted before) *Zuinglius* his teſtimony is not ſufficient to make good a charge againſt *Luther*. Let *Luthers* words be produced, and then it will appeare that he is juſtly charged. *Anſw.*

10. *He affirms* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *that as Chriſt died with great pain, ſo he ſeems to have ſuſtained paines in hell after death.* *Obj.*

Indeed I finde ſuch words in *Luther* on *Plal.* 16. and I acknowledge it to be a groſſe errour, ſo far am I from defending him in it.) But withall this I finde, that *Luther* was nothing confident in that particular. For he addes immediately, that he would ſo underſtand the words of *Peter Act.* 2. 24. until he were better informed. *Anſw* Chriſtus ſicut cum ſummo dolore mortuus eſt, ita videtur & dolores poſt mortem in inferno ſuſtinuiſſe, ut nobis omnia ſuperaret. *Luth. tom.* 3. *in Vf.* 16. Ita ego interea verbis Petri *Act.* 2. inherebo, donec meliora doctus fuero. *Luth. ibid.*

11. *That the Divinity of Chriſt ſuffered, or elſe he were none of his Chriſt.* *Obj.*

This alſo *Bellarmine* doth object againſt *Luther*; and I confeſſe, that if the word *Divinity* be ſtrictly and properly taken, the aſſertion is moſt erronious. But *Bellarmine* probably was not ignorant that *Aquinas* obſerveth, that becauſe of the iden ity that is betwixt the divine Nature, and the divine Perſon, ſometimes the Nature is put for the Perſon. And *Anſw.* *Bell. de Chriſto in Præfat.* Propter identitatem, quæ in divinis eſt inter naturam & hypoſtaſin, quandoq; natura ponitur pro perſonâ, vel hypoſtaſi. Et ſecundum hæc dicit Aug. naturam divinam eſſe conceptam & natam, quia ſcil. perſona Filii eſt concepta & nata ſecundum naturâ humanam. *Aquin. part.* 3. *quæſt.* 35. *art.* 1. *ad* 1.

that thus *Auſtine* ſaith, that the divine Nature was conceived and born, becauſe the Perſon of the Son was conceived and born, in reſpect of the humane nature. So in like manner *Luther* might ſay, that the Divinity, or divine Nature did ſuffer, becauſe the Perſon of the Son did ſuffer according to the humane nature. That *Luther* meant no otherwiſe then thus, is clearly his words, which I finde in *Gerhard*, viz. theſe, *If I ſhall ſuffer my ſelf to be perſwaded that onely the humane nature did ſuffer for me, truly Chriſt ſhall be a Saviour of ſmall worth unto me, for he himſelf at length will need a Saviour. --- If perhaps that bewitching lady Reaſon will reclaim, ſaying, The Divinity cannot ſuffer, nor dye; thou ſhalt anſwer, That indeed is true; yet nevertheleſſe becauſe the Divinity, and the Humanity in Chriſt make one perſon, therefore the Scripture becauſe of the hypoſtatical union doth attribute to the Divinity all thoſe things which happen to the Humanity; and ſo to the Humanity thoſe things which belong to the Divinity. And truly thus it is indeed; for we muſt needs confeſſe, This Perſon (Chriſt being pointed at) doth ſuffer and dye. But this Perſon is true God, Therefore it is rightly ſaid, The Son of God doth ſuffer. For though one part of him* (as I may ſo ſpeak) viz. *the Deity doth not ſuffer, yet that perſon, which is God, doth ſuffer in his other part, viz. the Humanity. For indeed the Son of God was crucified for us. That ſame, I ſay, that ſame Perſon was crucified according to the Humanity.* And again, *If our ſinnes, and Gods wrath due to our ſinnes be weighed in one ſcale, and in the other ſcale be put onely the death of humane nature, or onely a man having ſuffered for us; then the other ſcale will weigh us down to hel.*

Si enim perſuaderi mihi patiar, ut credam ſolam naturam humanam pro me paſſam eſſe, profectò Chriſtus mihi non magni pretii ſalvator erit, ſed ipſe tandem ſalvatore eget. —— Si fortè venefica illa domina ratio reclamare voluerit, dicens, Divinitas neque pati, neque mori poteſt; tu reſpondebis, verum id quidem eſt, nihilo minùs tamen quia Divinitas & Humanitas in Chriſto unam perſonam conſtituunt, Scriptura propter hypoſtaticam illam unionem etiam Divinitati omnia illa tribuit, quæ humanitati accidunt, & viciſſim humanitati quæ divinitatis ſunt. Et ſanè reverà ita ſe res habet; hoc enim fateri neceſſe eſt, Hæc perſona (monſtrato Chriſto) patitur, moritur. Hæc autem perſona eſt verus Deus. Rectè igitur dicitur, Filius Dei patitur. Etſi enim una ipſius pars (ut ſic loquar) Deitas videl. non patiatur, tamen ea perſona, quæ Deus eſt, patitur in altera ſuâ parte, nimirum humanitate. Revera enim Filius Dei pro nobis crucifixus eſt. Ipſa enim, ipſa, inquam, perſona crucifixa eſt ſecundum humanitatem. *Luther. apud Gerhard. de Perſon. & offic. Chriſti, ſect. 195.*

Si in unâ lance appendantur peccata noſtra & ira Dei peccatis noſtris debita, ac in alterâ lance ponatur tantùm humanæ naturæ mors aut homo tantùm pro nobis paſſus, tunc altera lanx ad infernum uſq; nos deprimet. Quod ſi verò in adverſâ lance ponatur Dei paſſio Dei mors, Dei ſanguis, ſeu Deus pro nobis paſſus, & mortuus, tunc gravior & ponderoſior fiat lanx iſta quàm omnia peccata noſtra, & univerſa Dei ira. *Luth. ibid.*

But

But if in the oppoſite ſcale be put the paſſion of God, the death of God, the blood of God, or God having ſuffered for us, then that ſcale will be more heavy and ponderous then all our ſinnes, and all Gods anger. This doth abundantly ſhew that *Luther* was moſt orthodox in this point touching Chriſts Perſon and Natures. And thus that alſo is anſwered, which immediately followeth, being indeed but the ſame with that which went before; viz. *That if the humane nature ſhould onely ſuffer for him, Chriſt were but a Saviour of vile account, and had need himſelf of another Saviour.* In what ſenſe *Luther* ſpake this, and how ſound and true it is in that ſenſe wherein he ſpake it, is evident by his own words before cited.

12. The Marqueſſe cites *Hoſpinian*, ſaying, that *Luther* held *the body and blood of Chriſt both is and may be found according to the ſubſtance not only in the bread and wine of the Euchariſt, or in the hearts of the faithfull, but alſo in all creatures, in fire, water, or in the rope and halter, wherewith deſperate perſons hang themſelves.* *Obj.*

Whether *Hoſpinian* writ thus of *Luther*, not having his book which is cited, I cannot ſay. *Hoſpinian* being, though a Proteſtant, yet againſt *Luther* in point of the Sacrament, might peradventure wreſt *Luthers* words beyond his meaning. However if *Luther* did hold ſo, I leave him to anſwer for himſelf, or ſome other to anſwer for him. I hold both him to have erred in his Conſubſtantiation, and the Romaniſts in their Tranſubſtantiation. *Anſw.*

13. *Luther* (as is objected) *averreth that the ten Commandements belong not unto us; for God did not lead us, but the Jews forth of Egypt.* *Obj.*

That *Luther* ſpeaketh to this effect, I grant; yet was he far from teaching that Chriſtians are free from the obſervation of the ten Commandements. For immediately after that which the Marqueſſe citeth, he ſaith thus; *Falſely therefore do fanaticall perſons burthen us with the Law of Moſes, who ſpake nothing unto us. Indeed we receive and acknowledge Moſes* *Anſw.*

Falſò ergo fanatici lege Moſi nos onerant, qui ad nos nihil locutus eſt. Doctorem ſanè Moſen recipimus, & agnoſcimus, unde multum ſalutaris, ut paulò poſt dicitur, doctrinæ diſcimus. Sed legiſlatorem aut gubernatorem

non agnoſcimus, cum ipſe ſuam miniſterium tantum ad illum populum reſtrinxerit. — Non habere Deos alienos, Deum timere, ei confidere, & obedire, non abuti ejus nomine, parentibus honorem habere, &c. ſunt ab omnibus ſervanda, & ad omnes pertinent, ſed non quia à Moſe præcepta, ſed quia naturæ hominum hæ leges (quæ in decalogo recitantur) inſcriptæ ſunt. Quare etiam gentes, quibus Moſes ignotus fuit, & quibus Deus non eſt locutus, ut illis, norunt Deo eſſe obediendum, Deum eſſe adorandum, honorandos parentes, &c. *Luth. tom. 3. Quomodo libri Moſis legendi ſunt.*

as a teacher, from whom we learn much wholeſome doctrine, as ſhall be ſhewed a little after. But we do not acknowledge him our Lawgiver, or Governour, ſeeing he reſtrained his Miniſtery to that people, viz. the Jews. — Not to have other gods, to fear God, to truſt in him, and to obey him, not to abuſe his name, to honor parents, &c. theſe things are to be obſerved by all, and belong to all: yet not becauſe they were commanded by Moſes, but becauſe theſe Laws (which are rehearſed in the Decalogue) are imprinted in mans nature. Wherefore alſo the heathens, that knew not Moſes, and to whom God did not ſpeak, as he did to the Iſraelites, knew that God is to be obeyed and worſhipped, that parents are to be honoured, &c.

This doctrine of *Luther* is no other then they of the *Roman* Church do teach. *Eſtius*, a great Doctor of that Church, writing upon thoſe words, Gal. 2. 19. *I through the Law am dead to the Law*, ſaith, *Although the ſenſe may ſeem more eaſie, if it be underſtood of the Law, as it is ceremonial; yet may the whole Law given by Moſes be underſtood, ſo far forth as it was given by Moſes. For the whole legiſlative office of Moſes doth ceaſe by Chriſt; neither is a Chriſtian bound by the Law of the Decalogue, but as it doth agree with the Law of nature, and is renewed by Chriſt.* So the Catechiſme ſet forth by the decree of the Councel of *Trent*, comming to explain the ten Commandements, ſaith, *Although the Law was given by the Lord in the Mount to the Jews, yet becauſe by nature it was long before imprinted in the mindes of all, and ſo God would have all at all times to obey him; it will be very profitable diligently to explain theſe words in which by the Miniſtery of Moſes*

Quamvis expeditior ſenſus videatur de lege quatenus ceremonialis eſt; nihil tamen vetat univerſam legem à Moſe latam intelligi, quatenus ab eo lata eſt. Tota enim Moſis legiſlatura ceſſat per Chriſtum, nec lege decalogi Chriſtianus tenetur, niſi quatenus cum lege naturæ convenit, & à Chriſto renovata eſt. *Eſt. ad Gal. 2. 19.*

Quamvis hæc lex Judæis in monte à Domino data fuerit, tamen quoniã naturâ omnium mentibus multo antè impreſſa, & conſignata erat, atque ob eam rem Deus univerſos homines illi perpetuò parere voluit; plurimum prodeſſe verba illa, quæ bus, Moſe miniſtro atque interprete, Hebræis promulgata eſt, & populi Iſraelitici hiſtoriam quæ myſteriorum eſt plena diligenter explicare. *Catechiſ. Trident. in initia explicationis decalogi.*

the

the Law was promulgated to the Hebrews, &c. Here they clearly intimate, that the ten Commandements do not concern Christians as published by *Moses*, but as imprinted in the heart of man by nature; which is all that *Luther* teacheth, who both in his greater and lesser Catechisme expoundeth the ten Commandements, which he would not have done, if he had held that they do not bind Christians to the observing of them. But this doctrine he expresly disclaimeth, as I have already shewed.

14. *Luther* is taxed for saying, that *faith, except it be without (even the least) good works, doth not justifie, and is not faith.* *Obj.*

Nothing is alleadged out of *Luthers* writings for proof of this, but onely *Covels* defence of Mr. *Hooker* is cited, which book I have not to peruse; yet I finde *Bellarmine* citing *Luthers* own words to this very purpose. But *Luthers* meaning (I suppose) was onely this, that in the work of justification faith is altogether without works, so that no works concur with it unto justification: not but that otherwise faith is accompanied with good works, so that where faith (true justifying faith) is, there wil be good works also. *Bellarmine* indeed doth tell of some rigid *Lutherans*, who so hold faith alone to justifie, as not to admit other vertues so much as to be present with it. And this he saith they would have to be *Luthers* opinion; yet he confesseth *Chemnitius*, a famous Lutheran, to agree with *Calvin* in this, that though faith alone doth justifie, yet faith that doth justifie is not alone; even as the heat of the Sun alone doth burn, yet that heat is not alone, but hath light joyned with it. *Answ.*

Tom. 1. operum suorum sic ait in 3. Propositione, Fides nisi sit sine ullis, etiam minimis operibus, non justificat imò non est fides. *Bellar. de Justif. l. 1. c. 12.*

Bell. ibid.

And for *Luther* himself, his writings plainly shew, that although he exclude works from having any thing to do in our justification, as generally Protestants do, yet he was no enemy to good works. *After that we have taught faith in Christ* (saith he) *we also teach good works.* And again, *We do not reject works, and love, as the adversaries*

Postquam fidem in Christum docuimus, docemus etiam de bonis operibus. Non quòd opera aut charitatem rejicimus, ut adversarii nos accu-

ſant. *Luth. in Gal.* 2. Fides non ficta, neque hypocritica, ſed vera, & vivax ea eſt, quæ exercet, & urget bona opera per charitatem. —— Verè non credit ſi opera charitatis fidem non ſequuntur. —— Dicunt, ſi fides, ſine opere juſtificat, ergò nihil operemur, ſed credamus ſolum, & faciamus quæ volumus. Non ſic impii, dicit Paulus: verum eſt, ſine operibus fidem juſtificare; ſed de fide verâ loquor, quæ poſtquam juſtificaverit, non ſtertet otioſa, ſed eſt per charitatem operoſa. *Luth. in Gal.* 5.6.

do accuſe us. And again, *Faith not fained, nor hypocritical, but true and lively, is that, which doth exerciſe, and urge good works through love.* So alſo again, *Some ſay, if faith without works do juſtifie, then let us not work, onely let us beleeve, and let us do what we will. Not ſo, ye ungodly,* ſaith Paul. *It is true, that faith alone doth juſtifie, but I ſpeak of true faith, which when it hath juſtified, is not idle, but doth work through love.*

Obj. 15. *Luther* is charged with ſaying, *That we are equal in dignity and honour with St.* Paul, *St.* Peter, *the bleſſed Virgin* Mary, *or all the Saints.*

Anſw. The Edition of *Luthers* Works which the Marqueſſe citeth, not agreeing in the *folio's* with that which I meet with, I cannot tell whether *Luther* ſaith thus or no; or if he do, in what ſenſe he ſaith it; but if he have ſuch words, I preſume he meaneth in reſpect of imputed righteouſneſſe, which is one and the ſame to all that beleeve, not in reſpect of inherent righteouſneſſe, which is more in ſome then in others. In reſpect of imputed righteouſneſſe, the Spouſe of Chriſt here upon earth is *all fair, and there is no ſpot in her.* But in reſpect of inherent righteouſneſſe juſt men are not *made perfect* until hereafter in the life to come. Heb. 12.23. In this reſpect *the inward man is renewed day by day,* 2 Cor. 4.16.

Sine maculâ deputatur, quia culpa non imputatur. *Gilbert. in Cant.* 4.7.

Obj. 16. *That all the holineſſe, which they have uſed in faſting, and prayer, enduring labours, chaſtiſing their bodies, auſterity and hardneſſe of life, may be daily performed by a hog or a dog.*

Anſw. Whether this charge be true, I cannot examine for the reaſon even now alleadged. Neither do I ſee how *Luther* or any rational man ſhould make prayer a thing performable by a hog or a dog. Otherwiſe who ſeeth not, but that theſe bruit creatures may be made to faſt (ſee *Jon.* 3.7.8.) and to endure bodily hardneſſe? The Apoſtle clearly diſtinguiſheth betwixt bodily exerciſe and godlineſſe, 1 *Tim.* 4.8. And both Scripture

Scripture and experience ſhew, that all theſe things mentioned by the Marqueſſe, may be performed by the wicked as well (I mean for the outward act) as by the godly. See *Iſa.* 1.11. to 15. and *Iſa.* 58.3. &c.

17. Another charge againſt *Luther* is that he holdeth, *That in the abſence of a Prieſt, a woman, or a boy, or any Chriſtian may abſolve.* *Obj.*

It ſeems then that *Luther* doth not ſay, that any may do it as well as a Prieſt; for then what need to ſay, *in abſence of a Prieſt*? And may not any Chriſtian declare the glad tydings of ſalvation unto an afflicted conſcience? Doth not the Apoſtle, ſpeaking to Chriſtians in general, bid them *comfort the feeble-minded*, 1 Theſſ. 5.14. As for that confeſſion to, and abſolution by a Prieſt, which the Romaniſts contend for, we know no ground nor warrant in Scripture for it. *Anſw.*

18. The next charge is, that he ſaith, *They onely communicate worthily, who have confuſed and erronious conſciences.* *Obj.*

I finde this objected by *Campian*, and anſwered by Dr. *Whitaker*, ſo as to aknowledge the truth of the aſſertion in this ſenſe, that they only are meet for the Sacrament, who are ſenſible of their ſins, and ſo of the need they have of Chriſt for the remiſſion of them, according to that of our Saviour, *The whole have no need of the Phyſitian, but they that are ſick*, Mat. 9.12. *Anſw.* *Camp. rat. 8. Whitak. Reſp. ad rat. Camp.*

19. *That a Prieſt, eſpecially in the New Teſtament, is not made, but born, not conſecrated, but created.* *Obj.*

Where *Luther* ſaith thus, I cannot finde, nor can I conjecture what he meaneth, if he do ſay it. *Anſw.*

20. *That the Sacrament were true, though it were adminiſtred by the Devil.* *Obj.*

How *Luther* is baited for this by *Hoſpinian* and *Covel*, his fellow-Proteſtants (as the Marqueſſe ſaith he is) I wanting their books cannot ſee: but if *Luther* meant of ſuch a Devil, as Chriſt ſpake of, *viz.* a *Judas*, Joh. 6. 70. neither Proteſtants nor Papiſts can juſtly oppoſe him, they holding (as generally they do) that the vertue of the Sacrament doth not depend upon the dignity of him by whom it is adminiſtred. *Anſw.*

21. *That*

Obj. 21. *That among Christians, no man can or ought to be a Magistrate; but each one is to other equally subject: and that among Christian men none is superior save one, and only Christ.*

Answ. This same charge is also brought against *Luther* by Mr. *Breerley*, who yet hath that which is a sufficient answer to it: For he cites *Luther* admonishing to obey the Civil Magistrate, only not allowing him power over the conscience. This indeed is Christs prerogative; and in this respect Christians are to be subject only unto Christ. *Ye are bought with a price, be ye not the servants of men*, 1 Cor. 7. 23. We must indeed be subject to the higher power *for conscience sake*, Rom. 13. 5. but that is, because God, who is Lord over the conscience, doth command it: so that it is not the Magistrates power, but Gods only that doth reach the conscience.

Breerl. Apol. tract. 3. sect. 5.

Obj. 22. *That the Husband, in case the Wife refuse his bed, may say unto her, If thou wilt not, another will; if the Mistresse will not, let the Maid come.*

Answ. This being objected by *Campian*, Dr. *Whitaker* answers, that *Luther* counselled the Husband to speak thus to the Wife, *in terrorem*, so as thereby to affright her out of her obstinacie. Yet he acknowledgeth, that *Luther* in point of Divorce went too far, and that he was not willing to plead for him. Neither will I, in any thing wherein he is justly taxed: As I confesse he is in the two next particulars that follow, (which also concern the same subject) if he did indeed assert those things which are alledged.

Obj. 23. *That Polygamie is no more abrogated then the rest of Moses law; and that it is free, as being neither commanded nor forbidden.*

Answ. Two places in *Luthers* Works are here quoted to make good this charge, one whereof I cannot find, but the other I meet with, (though not of that Edition indeed which is expressed) and find that which is quite contrary to this here objected. *Luther* commenting on *Gen.* 16. where *Abraham* by the advice of *Sarah* being barren, took *Hagar* for his Concubine, saith that Polygamie was then in use, and so *Abraham* might of himself following the custome

Abrahæ quoque insignis sanctimonia est, qui cum se usitato exemplo tueri, & aliam ducere posset, (polygamia enim tum in usu erat) tamen id non fecit, nisi uxore jubente. *Luth. in Gen. 16.*

of

of the times have taken another wife, but yet would not do it till *Sarah* did put him upon it. And from this fact of *Abraham*, he saith, we must not frame an example, as if we might do the like. And that though the Old Testament did permit Polygamie, yet now in the New Testament it is otherwise. So that *Luther* (so far as I find) was far from making polygamie a thing indifferent, and free for any that have a minde to it.

Porro ex hoc facto non est constituendum exemplum, quasi nobis eadē liceat facere: circumstantiæ enim considerandæ sunt, &c. Igitur singulare hoc horum conjugum factum neutiquam in exemplum habendum, præsertim in Novo Testamento; nam Vetus Testamentum polygamiam etiam liberorum causâ permisit. *Luth. ibid.*

24. *That it is no more in his power to be without a woman, then it is in his power to be no man: and that it is more necessary then to eat, drink, purge, or blow his nose.* *Obj.*

Luther here speaks of himself; and what his power was in this particular that he speaks of, he had best cause to know. *Answ.*

Indeed Mr. *Breerly* together with these words cites some other sayings of *Luther*, wherein he seems to speak generally of all, as being altogether unable to contain from women. And to this effect also the Marquesse here immediately after cites some words of *Luther* in Latine, saying that not any of his English shall be accessory to the transportation of such a blast into his native language. But it is usual with them of the Church of *Rome* to pervert, if not the words, yet the meaning of their adversaries, and especially of *Luther* and *Calvin*, against whom they bear the greatest hatred. Candor and ingenuity would easily conceive, that *Luther* spake in that manner, of men, as for most part they are, *viz.* not having the gift of continencie, which comparatively but few have. *Luthers* own words (as Mr. *Breerly* himself doth cite them) sufficiently declare his meaning. *The young woman* (saith he) *that hath not this high gift of continencie, can no more want a husband, or a man, then she can want meat, drink, sleep, &c.*

Breerl. Apol. tract. 2. cap. 2. sect. 10. subdiv. 11.

Puella, in quâ non est sublime hoc donum continentiæ, nihilo facilius carere potest marito, aut viro, quàm cibo, aut potu, somno, &c. *Luth. apud Breerl. loc. citat.*

25. *Luther* (saith the Marquesse) *saith, How can a man prepare himself to good; seeing it is not in his power to make his wayes evil? For God worketh the wicked work in the wicked.* *Obj.*

Answ. One of *Luthers* books, wherein he is said to speak thus, I finde among his Works, (*viz. de servo arbit.*) But the Edition being diverse from this here mentioned, I cannot finde the words that are objected. If *Luther* have these words, I doubt not but by the circumstances of the place it will appear, that he was free from charging God foolishly, however that expression seem harsh, *That God worketh the wicked work in the wicked.* Yet in some sense this may be affirmed. For a wicked work may be considered as a work, and as wicked. As a work, so it is from God, who is the supreme cause of every thing that hath any entity, or being in it. But it is not from God, as it is wicked; for so it imports defect, and therefore is not to be ascribed unto God, who cannot any way be defective, but it is to be imputed onely to the creature. But though God be not the author of mens wicked works as they are wicked, yet is he the orderer and disposer of them. And thus *Luther* might well say, *It is not in mans power to make his wayes evill, viz.* so as he himself will, but as God will, who permitteth, restraineth, ordereth, and disposeth mans wayes as he pleaseth. Thus, as the Prophet saith, *The way of man is not in himself, neither is it in man that walketh, to direct his steps*, Jer. 10. 23. *Bellarmine* himselfe doth tell us, That *God by his wonderful power doth rule the hearts even of the wicked, and doth restrain them so that they cannot effect, endeavour, will, or think otherwise then he doth permit, and doth turn their fault into their punishment; and being both most powerful, and most good, doth use their evil wills for the accomplishing of much good.* And hee cites *Augustine* saying, That *God doth not make mens wills evill, but hee maketh use of them as he pleaseth.* But the Cardinal speaks yet more fully: *God* (saith he) *doth not onely permit the wicked to*

Actus peccati & est ens, & est actus, & ex utroque habet quòd sit à Deo. Omne enim ens, quocunque modo sit, oportet quòd derivetur à primo ente. — Sed peccatum nominat ens, & actionem cum quodam defectu; defectus autem ille est ex causa creata scil. lib. arbit. *Aquin. 12. qu. 79. art. 2.*

Deus mirabili potentiâ regit corda etiam impiorum, & impedit ne aliud perficiant, conentur, velint, cogitent, quam quod ipse permittit, ipsamque culpam eis vertit in pœnam, & ad multa bona malis eorum voluntatibus ipse summè potens, summeq; bonus utitur. *Bellar. de amiss. grat. & statu peccati lib. 2. cap. 16.*

Non facit voluntates malas, sed utitur eis ut voluerit. *Aug. apud Bellar. ibid.*

Deus non solùm permittit impios

to do many evill things, but also is president over their evill wils, and doth rule and govern them, yea wrest and bend (N B) *by working invisibly in them; so that although they be evill through their owne fault, yet by the divine providence, not positively, but permissively they are ordered to one evill, rather then to another.* This expression, which *Bellarmine* here useth of Gods wresting and bending the wils of wicked men in their wicked designs, is (I think) as high as any that either *Luther* or *Calvin* do use, of whom yet the Romanists, and amongst them *Bellarmine* himselfe complains, as making God the authour of sinne, though they disclaim and abhor the Position as much as they that are so invective against them,

agere multa mala, &c. sed etiam presidet ipsis voluntatibus malis, easque regit & gubernat, torquet ac flectit in eis invisibiliter operando; ut licet vitio proprio malæ sint, tamen à divinâ providentiâ ad unum potius malum, quàm ad aliud, non positivè, sed permissivè ordinentur. *Bellar. ibid. cap.* 13.

Before the Marquesse hath fully done with *Luther*, he hath by the way a fling at *Zuinglius*, saying that he denies all *Pauls* Epistles to be sacred. But in the place cited I finde it otherwise. *Zuinglius* doth not deny all *Pauls* Epistles to be sacred, yea he saith expresly that he doth not deny this; onely he saith, that *Paul* then when he wrote, did not attribute so much to his Epistles, as that whatsoever was contained in them, should be sacred; he thought that if the Apostle had done so, it had been too much arrogancy in him; wherein I am far from being of his minde. *Page* 79.

Quasi verò Paulus Epistolis suis jam tum tribuerit, ut quicquid in eis contineretur sacrosanctum esset. Non quòd ipse velim non sacrosancta esse, quæ illius sint, sed quod nolim Apostolis imputari immoderatam arrogantiam, *&c. Zuingl. tom.* 2. *fol.* 10.

Answ. There is nothing material, which the Marquesse here doth further alleadge against *Luther*; onely he citeth two or three passages, wherein *Luther* doth vaunt of himself, which though it may perhaps argue some vanity of the man, yet doth it not argue any falsity of his doctrine. *I never required* (saith *Luther*) *that any should account me modest, or holy, but that all should embrace the Gospel.* Yet might he without any vain boasting say, (as the Marquesse objecteth Page 170.) that he would not

Nunquam exegi ut me quis modestum aut sanctum haberet, sed ut Evangelium omnes agnoscerent. *Luth. ad Præfat. Latomi.*

not have his doctrine to be judged either by Men or Angels; that is, he being assured of its truth, and agreeableness to Gods word, he would not refer it to the censure either of Men or Angels, so as to submit unto them if they should condemn it. In this he had respect (it seems) to that of the Apostle, *Though we, or an Angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, then that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed*, Gal. 1.8. And thus much for answer to those things which are alleadged against *Luther*.

Pag. 80. In the next place the Marquesse fals upon *Calvin*, and brings many charges against him; but by the examination of the matter it will appear, that *Calvin* is altogether as injuriously dealt with as *Luther*, if not more.

Of Calvins *Doctrine.*

Obj. 1. *He maintains* (its said) *that three Essences do arise out of the holy Trinity.*

Answ. I wish the Marquesse had either cited *Calvins* words, or at least the place so, as that I might have found what he saith. But he onely citeth *Tract. Theol. p.* 793. Where in the Edition which I have (*viz. Genev. an.* 1576.) is no such thing to be found. Neither need I to search into *Calvins* Works for the answering of this charge. *Bellarmine* himself (who would have been ready enough to find out any such grosse stuffe in him) doth justifie him in this point, confessing that *Calvin* doth acknowledge onely one nature in three distinct persons. And that he doth plainly say, that the Essence is communicated to the Son by the Father: which also doth take away the next charge, viz. *That the Son hath his substance distinct from the Father, and that he is a distinct God from the Father.* By *Bellarmines* own confession *Calvins* doctrine is directly contrary.

Calvinus fatetur lib. 1. *Instit. cap.* 13. *sect.* 13. *Unam numero naturam esse in tribus distinctis personis. Bellar. de Christ. l.* 2. *c.* 19.

Præterea ibid. sect. 23. *aperte dicit, essentiam à Patre, Filio esse communicatam. Bellar. ibid.*

Obj. 2. *He teacheth* (saith the Marquesse) *That the Father can neither wholly, nor by parts communicate his nature to Christ, but must withall be deprived thereof himself.*

Answ. This is clearly confuted by *Calvins* words which *Bellarmine* alleadgeth: *If there be any difference in the Essence* (*viz.* of the Father and the Son)

Si in essentia est discretio, respondeant, annon cum Filio eam communicaverit?

let

let them answer whether the Father did communicate it to the Son, or no? Now this could not be in part; for it is not lawfull to make half a God. Besides by this means they should foully tear in peeces Gods Essence. It remains, that the whole and intire Essence is common to the Father and the Son.

Hoc verò non potuit esse ex parte, quia dimidium fabricare Deum nefas esset. Adde quod hoc modo fœdè lacerarent Dei essentiam. Restat ut tota & in solidum Patris & Filii sit communis. *Calvin Instit. lib. 1. cap. 13. sect. 23. citat. à Bellar. ubi suprà.*

3. *Calvin is said to deny that the Son is begotten of the Fathers substance, and to affirm that he is God of himself, not God of God.* *Obj.*

Divers Romanists besides, and before the Marquesse would make *Calvin* guilty of some grosse heresie, in saying that the Son is αὐτόθεος *God of himself*. But *Bellarmine* hath a whole Chapter about this very point, and doth clear *Calvin* from that aspersion which others cast upon him, shewing that he spake of the Son, not in respect of his Person, but in respect of his Essence; and that his meaning is, that the Person of the Son is begotten of the Father, but that the Essence of the Son is not begotten, nor produced, but is of it self. So another learned Jesuite, viz. *Gregorius de Valentia* (as I finde him cited) doth ingenuously confesse, that *Calvins* doctrine in this point, being rightly understood, is sound and true, *viz.* That the Son as he is essentially God, is of himself, and only is from the Father as he is a Person. When the Fathers and Councels affirm the Son to be God of God, he saith, they take the word *God* personally, *viz.* as it signifieth both the Person of the Father, and of the Son: yet (saith he) the Son, as he is essentially God, so he is not from another. And in this sense he saith *Epiphanius* seemeth to have called the Son αὐτόθεον, that is, *God of himself*. *Answ.*

Dum rem ipsam excutio, & Calvini sententias diligenter considero, non facilè audeo pronuntiare illum in hoc errore fuisse, siquidem docet Filium esse à se respectu essentiæ, non respectu personæ, & videtur dicere velle, personam esse genitam à Patre, essentiam non esse genitam, nec productam, sed esse à seipsâ, *&c. Bellar. loco antè citato.*

Revera si attentè Calvinus legatur, tantùm videbitur voluisse, Filium, ut Deus quidem essentialiter est, ex se esse, & solummodo ut persona est, esse ex Patre. Id quod verum est. Nam licet verissimè Patres & Concilia asserant, Deum esse ex Deo, accipiendo vocabulum Dei personaliter, ut scil. significat quoque personam ipsam Patris & Filii; tamen Filius quatenus essentialiter Deus est, id est, ut est illud simplissimum quod est Deus, non est ab alio, quia ut sic est quid absolutum. —— In eo sensu videtur Filium appellasse αὐτόθεον Epiph. hær. 69. *Greg. de Valent. citat. à Rivet. in Gen. exercit. 14.*

Obj. 4. He taxeth *Calvin* for saying, *That dream of the absolute power of God, which the Schoolmen have brought in, is execrable blasphemy.*

Answ. *Calvin* in one of the places alleadged (for the other I cannot consult) saith thus: *Neither do we bring in the device of absolute power; which as it is profane, so we have just cause to detest it.* But *Calvin* was far from denying that absolute power of God, whereby he is able to do whatsoever he pleaseth: Only he seems to deny God to have such an absolute power, as to be able to do any thing, whether it be right or wrong. For he addes immediately, *We do not fein God to be without law, who is a law unto himself.*

Neque tamen commentum ingerimus absolutæ potentiæ, quod sicuti profanum est, ita meritò detestabile nobis esse debet. *Calv. Instit. l. 3. c. 23. sec. 2.* Non fingimus Deum exlegem, qui sibi ipsi lex est. *Calv. ubid.*

Obj. 5. It is objected against *Calvin*, that those words, *The Father is greater then I*, (Joh. 14. 28.) he will not have restrained to the humane nature, but will extend them to Christ as God and man.

Answ. Many places are cited for proof of this; some whereof, for want of the same Edition, though I have the book, I cannot examine, *viz. Tract. Theol. p. 794.* & 792. my book in those pages hath nothing to the purpose. And so also it is in all other places, where the Marquesse doth cite those *Theological Tractates.* Another place here also the Marquesse citeth, which is as if it were not cited, viz. *Calvin* on *Mat.* 22. the verse being not mentioned, the quotation is to no purpose. Two other places he cites also, viz. *Calvin Iustit. l. 2. c. 14. §. 3.* and *on Job. 17. 12.* but in neither of these places doth *Calvin* speak any thing about those words, *My Father is greater then I.* It may seem strange, that the Marquess should here cite so many places out of *Calvins* Works, and yet pretermit his Commentary upon those very words about which he taxeth him. Now *Calvin* commenting upon those words, saith, That the *Arians* did wickedly abuse this testimony, to prove that Christ is but a secondary God, and not equal with the Father; and that yet on the other side, the

Variè detortus fuit hic locus. Ariani, ut Christum probarent quendam secundarium esse Deum, objiciebant minorem esse Patre. Patres orthodoxi, ut tasi calumniæ ansam præciderent, dicebant hoc debere ad naturam humana-

the Orthodox Fathers did not rightly interpret the words of Christs humane nature: For that here neither Christs humane nature, nor his eternal divinity (the saith) is spoken of; but Christ according to the weaknesse of onr capacity doth set himselfe in the midst betwixt God and us. He explains it further thus: *Christ* (saith he) *doth not compare his Fathers Divinity with his own, nor doth he compare his humane nature with his Fathers divine essence; but rather his present estate with that heavenly glory, into which he was by and by to be received.* Though *Calvins* expositon here may seem somewhat quaint, neither do I see why the received interpretation should not stand, *viz.* that Christ spake of himself, as he was man; yet however *Calvin* plainly shews, that he was farre from having any compliance with the *Arians*, in denying the equality of the Sonne with the Father.

nam referri. Atqui ut impiè hoc testimonio abusi sunt Ariani, ita nec recta nec consentanea fuit Patrum solutio. Hic enim neque de humanâ Christi natura, neque de æterna ejus divinitate sermo habetur; sed pro infirmitatis nostræ captu se medium inter nos & Deum constituit. — Ut res clariùs pateat, crassiùs adhuc loquendum est. Non confert hîc Christus Patris divinitatem cum suâ, nec humanam suam naturam divinæ Patris essentiæ comparat; sed potius statum præsentem cœlesti gloriæ, ad quam mox recipiendus erat, &c. *Calv. ad Joh.* 14. 28.

6. *Calvin* is charged to sever the person of the Mediator from Christs divine person; and to maintain with *Nestorius*, two persons in Christ, the one humane, and the other divine. *Obj.*

Calvin had nothing to do with the heresie of *Nestorius*, neither do the places alleadged prove him any whit guilty of it. He speaks indeed of the person of the Mediator, yet doth he not make that a distinct person from Christs divine person. *I meddle not yet* (saith he) *with the person of Mediator.* And again, *We do not yet speak of the person of Mediator.* His meaning plainly is this, and no more then this; that as yet he spake of Christ only as God, and not as Mediator. And when he saith, that *Christ took upon him the person and office of Mediator*, he seems to take the word *person* not for that which in Greek is *hypostasis*, a substance subsisting by it self; but as the Latines frequently use the word for quality, or state. Thus he seems *Answ.*

Mediatoris personam nondum attingo. *Calv. Instit. lib.* 1. *cap.* 13. *sect.* 9. Nondum de Mediatoris personâ nobis sermo est. *sect.* 23. Mediatoris suscepit personam & munus. *sect.* 24.

Genere personam alicujus, &c. *Vide* Vallam *Elegant. lib.* 6. *cap.* 34.

ſeems to uſe the word *Perſon*, in that after it immediately he adds the word *office*. However, *Calvin* doth expreſſely condemn the hereſie of *Neſtorius*, and hath a whole Chapter to prove that in Chriſt two natures make but one Perſon. *Calvin* therefore here hath hard meaſure, being charged with *Neſtorianiſme*, when as he not only in plaine tearms doth explode it, but alſo doth bend his whole force againſt it.

Procul abigendus eſt à nobis Neſtorii error. —— In Epheſinâ ſynodo merito damnatus fuit Neſtorius. *Calv. Inſt. l. 2. cap. 14. ſect. 4. Similiter etiam ſect. 5.*

Obj. 7. *Calvin* is taxed for ſaying, That *Chriſts ſoule was ſubject to ignorance; and that this was the only difference betwixt us and him, that our infirmities are of neceſſity, and his were voluntary.*

Anſw. It is true, *Calvin* underſtands that *Luke* 2.40. and 52. ſo, as that Chriſt as man was not perfect in knowledge at firſt, no more then he was in ſtature. And ſurely this ſeems to be the plain and ſimple meaning of the words, eſpecially thoſe *v.* 52. *And Jeſus increaſed in wiſdome, and ſtature*; though others expound them, that as Chriſt grew in age, ſo he did ſhew forth his wiſdome more and more. But *Janſenius* confeſſeth that *Ambroſe* ſaith, that Chriſt as man did grow in knowledge. And that the ſame expoſition alſo is found under the name of *Theophilus*, another ancient Author. He adds indeed, that theſe ſayings of the Ancients are well underſtood by the Schoolmen of Chriſts wiſdome acquired by uſe and experience, when as before from his firſt conception he had the knowledge of all things infuſed into him. Yet he ſpeaks of this infuſed knowledge only as a thing which he thought very probable, not as a thing which he held moſt certain. And he confeſſeth that ſome (I preſume he means of the Church of *Rome*; for otherwiſe he would not ſo much regard what they thought) are of opinion, that it cannot be proved by Scripture, that ſuch

Ambroſius hoc loco fatetur Chriſtum ſecundum quod homo erat, profeciſſe. —— Et ſub nomine Theophili in catena aureâ legitur, &c. Proficere dicitur ex eo, quòd humanitas proficiebat in ipſo. *Janſen. Concord. cap. 12.*

Omninò videtur Chriſto etiam quatenus homini tribuendam perfectam omnium rerum à conceptione cognitionem ei infuſam. —— Omninò veriſimile eſt, &c. *Janſ. ibid.*
Verùm cum ſapientiam hanc, quæ Chriſto tanquam homini ab initio conceptionis ſit infuſa, quâque omnia ab initio cognoviſſet, etiam ut homo, quidam putent non poſſe ex Scripturis

ſuch wiſdome was infuſed into Chriſt from his conception, whereby as man he ſhould know all things at the very firſt: and therefore they think the words of S. *Luke* more ſimply underſtood thus, that *Chriſt in reſpect of that wiſdome which he had as man, did truly grow, as other men do, though in a far greater meaſure.* Thus alſo did *Eraſmus* (who was before *Calvin*) underſtand it, not thinking it meet that the opinion of the Schoolmen ſhould ſway in this matter.

probari, putant ſimpliciùs hunc locum ſic explicandum, ut dicatur Chriſtum ſecundum ſapientiam divinam, h.e. eam quæ ei competit tanquam Deo, non profeciſſe; ſecundum ſapientiam autem humanam, h.e. eam, quæ ei ut homini competit, verè profeciſſe, hominum quidem more, ſed tamen ſupra modum humanum. *Janſen. ibid.*

Neque verò perinde nos moveat, ſi id pugnet cum aliquo placito Scholaſticorum, &c. *Eraſ. ad Luc.* 2. 52.

8. Of like nature is that which followeth, *viz.* that *Calvin* ſaith, *It is evident that ignorance was common to Chriſt with the Angels.* And that he particularizeth wherein, *viz.* that *He knew not the day of judgment; nor that the fig-tree was barren, till he came near it.* *Obj.*

That Chriſt as man, knew not what kind of tree it was, untill he came nigh it, *Calvin* thinks not improbable; yet he grants, that Chriſt might on purpoſe go unto it, though he were not ignorant of the event. Concerning the other place, *viz.* Mar. 13. 32. he is more confident; and ſo well might he be, the Text being clear and expreſſe: *But of that day and houre knoweth no man, no not the Angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.* Some underſtand it ſo, that Chriſt did not know it, to make it known: But thus neither doth the Father know it; for he doth not make it known. It is therefore to be underſtood of Chriſt in reſpect of his humane nature. And ſo *Cyril* underſtands it, as *Janſenius* confeſſeth, though he himſelf rather likes the other expoſition. *Anſw.*

Nihil abſurdi eſt, ſi dicamus, ſecundum hominem ſpeciem arboris fuiſſe illi incogniam: fieri tamen poteſt, ut conſultò acceſſerit, eventum non ignorans. *Calv. ad Mat.* 21. 18.

Certè Cyrillus lib. 9. Theſaur. cap. 4. fatetur Chriſtum de ſe, quatenus homo erat, dixiſſe, quòd ignoraret diem judicii, &c. *Janſen. Concord. cap.* 123.

9. The Marqueſſe ſaith, that *Calvin is not afraid to cenſure certain words of Chriſt to be but a weak confutation of what he ſought to refute.* And that he ſayes, *Chriſt ſeems here not to reaſon ſolidly.* *Obj.*

Anſw. This is juſt as if one ſhould charge their Angelical Doctor *Aquinas* with ſaying, That *there ſeems to be no God*, and that, *God ſeems to be a body*: Or rather indeed with ſaying, That *there is no God*, and that *God is a body*. For thus is *Calvin* dealt with, commenting upon that, Matth. 12.25,26. *Every Kingdome divided againſt it ſelf*, &c. *If Satan caſt out Satan*, &c. by way of objection he ſaith, *This confutation may ſeem not very ſolid*; and then immediately he anſwers the objection. Thus alſo in his Commentary upon that *Mat.*9.5. *Whether is eaſier to ſay*, &c. *Chriſt* (ſaith he) *doth ſeem not to reaſon ſolidly*, &c. Then preſently he addes, *But the anſwer is eaſie*, &c. Of this ſame nature are the five next following paſſages, wherein *Calvin* is made to ſay that, which (as the manner of Expoſitors is for the better elucidating of that which they have in hand) he only brings in as an objection, and preſently gives anſwer to it. This is a peece of the ſtrangeſt dealing that ever I met with. I do not finde that the Marqueſſe had theſe allegations from any, as many of the reſt (I ſee) he had: neither can I think him to have been of ſuch an ignoble diſpoſition, as wittingly and wilfully ſo to pervert a mans words and meaning. Therefore I ſuppoſe it was his immoderate deſire to finde any thing in *Calvin*, that might be liable to exception, which made him haſtily take hold of that which did occur, never conſidering the true ſenſe and meaning of it. But to proceed.

Videtur quòd Deus non ſit. *Aquin. part.*1.*qu.*2.*art.*3.
Videtur quòd Deus ſit corpus. *Ibid. quæſt.*3.*art.*2.

Videtur tamen parùm ſolida eſſe refutatio, *&c.* Verùm nulla in Chriſtum cecidit talis ſuſpicio, *&c. Calv. ad Mat.*12.25.

Videtur tamen parùm ſolidè ratiocinari Chriſtus, *&c.* Sed in promptu eſt ſolutio, *&c. Calv. ad Mat.*9.5.

Obj. 10. *Calvin* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *ſaith, that Chriſt refuſed and denied, as much as lay in him, to perform the office of a Mediator.*

Anſw. It's true, *Calvin* hath theſe words, but they alſo are part of an objection. For the very next word is, *Reſpondeo*, I anſwer. So that I might have joyned this with thoſe other paſſages immediately before mentioned; though there ſeems indeed ſome more colour for this allegation then for the other,

Calv. ad Mat. 26.39.

other, yet is there no juſt ground for this neither.

11. The next charge againſt *Calvin* is, that he ſaith, That *Chriſt manifeſted his own effeminateneſſe, by his ſhunning of death.* *Obj.*

This alſo is of like nature with the former. *Calvin* writing upon thoſe words, Joh. 12. 27. *Now is my ſoul troubled*, &c. ſaith, that this doth ſeem to differ much from that which is next before. For that there Chriſt ſhewed great courage, exhorting his Diſciples not only to ſuffer death, but to ſuffer it willingly and deſirouſly, if the caſe ſo require; but now by ſhunning death, he confeſſeth his weakneſſe (or ſoftneſſe) of ſpirit. Then he addes by way of anſwer, that yet here is nothing which doth not very well agree. That it was expedient and neceſſary for our ſalvation that the Son of God ſhould be ſo affected. And that hence we are to know, that Chriſts death was no ſport or play unto him, &c. So then the word *mollities* (which the Marqueſſe rendreth *effeminateneſſe*, and not unfitly, I confeſſe, for it properly ſignifieth *ſoftneſſe*, and is uſed for *ſoftneſſe of ſpirit*) that word, I ſay, is here applied to Chriſt in a way of * objection, though *Calvin* doth poſitively aver, that Chriſt was deeply affected with the horror of his approaching death; and that he was ſo indeed, is moſt evident both by this, and other places of the Evangelical hiſtory. *Anſw.*

Videtur initio ſententia hæc multum diſcrepare à proximo ſermone. Illud pluſquam heroici pectoris ſignum erat, hortari ſuos non modò ad ſubeundam mortem, ſed libenter & cupidè oppetendam, ubi res ita poſtulat: nunc mortem refugiendo mollitiem ſuam fatetur. Nihil tamen hîc legimus, quod non optimè conveniat, &c. Cæterum ſaluti noſtræ utile fuit, imò neceſſarium, ſic affici Filium Dei. — Sciamus ergo mortem non fuiſſe delitias, aut luſum Chriſto, &c. *Calv. ad Joh. 12.27.*

* *Scornful men* (Naſuti homines, *as* Calvin *ſpeaks*) *are apt to interpret Chriſts fear of death effeminateneſſe.*

12. The Marqueſſe addes, *He ſaith that Theeves and Malefactors haſten to death with obſtinate reſolution, deſpiſing it with haughty courage, others mildly ſuffer it. But what conſtancie, courage, or ſtoutneſſe was there in the Son of God, who was aſtoniſhed, and in a manner ſtricken dead with fear of death? How ſhameful a tenderneſſe was it to be ſo far tormented with fear of common death, as to melt in bloody ſweat, and not be able to be comforted but by the ſight of Angels?* *Obj.*

Calvin diſputes againſt thoſe who would have it only a meer *Anſw.*

Convicti ad aliud tandem cavillum transiliunt; quamvis mortem timuerit Christus, maledictionem & iram Dei, à quâ se tutum esse noverat, non timuisse. Sed expendant pii lectores, quàm honorificum hoc sit Christo, molliorem ac magis meticulosum fuisse, quàm plerosque gregarios homines. Contumaciter ad mortem properant latrones, &c. *Calv. Instit. lib. 2. cap. 16. sect. 12.*

meer bodily death, not having any curse and wrath of God annexed to it, which Christ did fear. *But* (saith he) *let the godly Readers consider, how honourable this is for Christ, to have been more effeminate and faint-hearted then most ordinary men.* Then follow the words objected, *Theeves and other Malefactors do hasten unto death with obstinate resolution*, &c. The *series* of the Discourse doth plainly shew, that *Calvin* speakes not positively, but upon supposition, that if it were so, as some hold, then all this would follow; which he is so farre from asserting, that by the absurdity of it, he proves the erroniousnesse of their opinion whom he doth confute.

Obj. 13. The Marquesse proceeds in his charge against *Calvin*, saying, *He saith that the same vehemencie took * Christ from the present memory of the heavenly decree; so that he forgot at that instant, that he was sent hither to be our Redeemer.*

* *Rather it should be*, took from Christ, &c.

Answ. This allegation I grant, is true. *Calvin* on Mat. 26.39. hath these words indeed; neither will I undertake the defence of all *Calvins* expressions, or opinions: I think it not so safe to ascribe forgetfulnesse unto Christ, though as *Calvin* meant it, I do not see that there is any impiety in it. And the word ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι Mar. 14.33. importing horrour, and astonishment, may seem to make for it. However *Calvin* was carefull to inculcate this, that he would have none to think that there was any turbulencie and disorder in Christs affections, as there is in ours; but onely that Christ was stricken with fear and anxiety so far forth as the sound and intire nature of man can bear.

Tenendum quidem est, quod nuper dixi, non fuisse turbulentos Christi affectus, qui more nostro ejus animo puram moderationem excuterent, &c. *Calv. ad Mat. 26.39. Ibid.* Resp. non posse in hâc naturæ nostræ corruptione perspici affectuum fervorem cum temperie qualis in Christo fuit. *Vide plura. Et vide Instit. l. 2. c. 16. sect. 12.*

Obj. 14. *Calvin* is taxed for saying, That *Christs prayer was not premeditate, but the force and extremity of grief wringed from him this hasty speech, to which a correction was presently added, and he chastiseth, and recalleth that vow of his, which he had let suddenly slip.*

I ac-

I acknowledge that *Calvin* hath theſe words in the ſame place, *viz.* on *Mat.* 26. 39. neither do I much approve of them: yet by what hath been ſaid already, it may appeare that *Calvins* meaning was good, only ſo to ſet forth the anxiety of Chriſts ſoul, as yet to exempt him from whatſoever is evil and ſinful. *Bellarmine* himſelf, though he rake up, and rack *Calvins* ſayings, to make them odious, yet confeſſeth that he ſaith, that *Chriſts nature was perfect, and that there was no inordinacie of affections in him.* But I will make uſe of the words of learned Dr. *Field*, who hath anſwered theſe objections againſt *Calvin*, long ago. *Anſw.*

Dicit (Calvinus) Chriſti naturam fuiſſe perfectam, & nullam in eo fuiſſe paſſionum inordinationem. *Bellar. de Chriſt. lib. 4. cap. 8.*

The Papiſts (ſaith he) *impute I know not what blaſphemy to* Calvin, *for that he ſaith, Chriſt corrected the deſire and wiſh that ſuddenly came from him. But they might eaſily underſtand, if they pleaſed, that he is far from thinking, that any deſire, or expreſſing of deſire was ſudden in Chriſt, as riſing in him without conſent of reaſon, or that he was inconſiderate in any thing he did or ſpake; but his meaning is, that ſome deſires which he expreſſed, proceeded from inferior reaſon, that conſidereth not all circumſtances; and that he corrected and revoked the ſame, not as evil, but as not proceeding from the full and perfect conſideration of all things fit to be thought upon, before a full reſolution be paſſed.* Another learned man alſo ſaith, that *Calvin* calls thoſe words, *Neverthleſſe not as I will, but as thou wilt*, a correction, in that ſenſe as Rhetoricians are wont to uſe the figure ſo called: not as if he did amend that which was ill ſpoken, but ſeaſonably to adde that which yet was not ſpoken. And he cites *Origen* ſaying, that Chriſt did in thoſe words recall his deſire, and as it were recogitate. So likewiſe he cites *Hierome*, and the Interlineary Gloſſe, ſaying, that Chriſt did return into himſelf. *Hierome* doth yet further paraphraſe thus: *He ſaith, Let* *Dr. Field*, of the Church, book 5 chap. 18.

Calvinus appellat poſteriora hæc verba *Non ſicut ego*, &c. correctionem, ſed eo ſenſu, quo Rhetores correctionis figurâ uti ſolent; non quaſi aliquod malè effatum emendaret, ſed ut quod adhuc effatum non erat, opportunè adderet. *Origen*, revocans deſiderium, & quaſi recogitans. *Hieron. & Gloſſ. Interl.* revertens in ſemetipſum. *Parker* (ni fallor, neque enim nunc mihi liber eſt ad manum) *de deſcenſ. Chriſt. ad infer.*

Non, inquit, hoc fiat, quod humano affectu loquor, ſed propter quod ad terras tuâ voluntate deſcendi. *Hieron. ad Mat. 26. 39.*

Relinquebat naturam humanam partes ſuas agere, quemadmodum egiſſet, ſi neque cum Divinitate conjuncta fuiſſet, nec de divino decreto quicquam ſciviſſet.—— Apte appoſita moderatio: Sic enim naturæ infirmitatem oſtendit, ut ultra divinæ voluntatis terminos non egrediatur. *Maldon. ad Mat. 26. 39.*

not that be, which I ſpeak with a humane affection; but that, for which by thy will I deſcended to the earth. The Jeſuite *Maldonate* ſaith, that *Chriſt left the humane nature to act its part, as it would have done, if it had not been joyned with the divine nature, nor had known any thing of Gods decree.* So he writes upon thoſe words, *Father, if it be poſſible*, &c. And upon thoſe, *Nevertheleſſe not as I will*, &c. he ſaith, *A moderation is fitly added: For he ſo ſhewes the infirmity of nature, that yet he does not exceed the bounds of Gods will.* That which *Maldonate* here cals *a moderation*, and *Hierome* cals *a returning into himſelf*, and *Origen* and the Gloſſe call *a recalling of the deſire*, and *a recogitating*, is as much as that which *Calvin* cals *a correction.*

Obj. 15. But the Marqueſſe proceeds, and charges *Calvin* with theſe words: *Thus we ſee Chriſt to be on all ſides ſo vexed, as being overwhelmed with deſperation, he ceaſed to call upon God, which was as much as to renounce his ſalvation: and this* (the Marqueſſe ſaith, he ſaith a little before) *was not fained, or as a thing only acted upon a ſtage.*

Anſw. Surely all that have any ſpark of Chriſtianity in them, muſt needs aſſent to *Calvin* in this, that Chriſts paſſion, as the Evangeliſts relate it, was not fained nor acted upon a ſtage; though (it ſeems) they of the Church of *Rome* on Good Friday (as they call it) uſe to make a kind of Stage-play of it. But how unworthily is *Calvin* here uſed? He is made to ſay, that Chriſt was overwhelmed with deſperation, ceaſed to call upon God, and did as much as renounce his ſalvation. But any that look into the place alleadged, may ſee that *Calvin* is far from this blaſphemy. That which he ſaith, is this, that the wicked enemies of Chriſt, by Satans inſtigation, deriding him when he cried, *Eli, Eli*, &c. did

Nec verò fictè vel theatricè conqueritur ſe à Patre relictum. *Calv. ad Mat. 27. 46.*

In die Paraſceves crucifixus paulatim detegitur, & oſtenditur. *Bellar. de Imag. Sanctor. lib. 2. cap. 23.*

Sic impios Chriſti hoſtes impulit, *(nempe Satanas)* ut protervè ejus precationem in riſum converterent; volens hoc artificio eum præcipuis armis ſpoliare. Et certè hæc admodum gravis tentatio eſt, *&c.* Tantundem igitur valuit hæc ironia, vel caninus latratus, ac ſi negaſſent Chriſto quicquam eſſe negotii cum Deo, quòd Eliam implorans in aliud aſylum ſe conferret. Sic vide-

did labour to overwhelm him with desperation, and to make him cease calling upon God, which had been as much as to renounce salvation.

mus omni ex parte fuisse vexatum, ut desperatione obrutus ab invocando Deo abstineret; quod erat saluti renuntiare. *Calvin. ad Mat.* 27. 47.

As before *Calvin* was made positively to aver that, which hee brought in by way of objection; so here that is censured as spoken by him, which he only speaks of Christs enemies. But it is worthy to be observed, that immediately after those words, which are so pitifully perverted, *Calvin* comforts himself and others with this consideration, that if our words, which are right and good, be depraved and slandered, it is no marvel, seeing Christ himself was thus dealt with. But to proceed.

Cæterum si hodiè tam conductitii Antichristi rabulæ, quàm domesti ici etiam nebulones, quæ à nobis rectè dicta sunt, suis calumniis indignè depravant, ne miremur idem nobis quod capiti nostro accidere. *Calvin, ibid.*

16. *Calvin* (as is alleadged) saith, That *Christ in his soul suffered the terrible torments of a damned and forsaken man.* *Obj.*

This allegation is true, and so also is that, which follows in the next passage but two, and I note it here, because it is of the same nature. *It is no marvel, if it be said that Christ went down into hell, since he suffered that death, wherewith God in wrath striketh wicked doers.* *Calvin* hath these sayings in the place alleadged, *viz.* Instit. lib. 2. cap. 16. sect. 10. I am not of *Calvins* mind for the meaning of the article about Christs descent into hell, as I have elsewhere shewed. And peradventure *Calvin* might go too far in exaggerating the sufferings of Christs soul, as others in this may be too remisse. But when *Calvin* speaketh of Christ suffering the torments of a damned man, he means such torments as are without all mixture of sin, for that he alwayes removes far from Christ, as I have shewed before. *Answ.* *Serm. on Psal.* 16. 10.

And that Christ did suffer the torments of a forsaken man, his own words upon the crosse do shew, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* Christ had speciall cause (as *Jansenius* observes) to complaine, that he was forsaken of his God, in that he had the divine nature united to him, and his humane nature did not

Propriâ quâdam ratione Christus se derelictum à Deo suo conqueri potuit, qui cum unitam sibi haberet divinitatem, ejus tamen consolationem in carne

feel

non ſenſit diffuſam. *Janſen. concord. cap.*143.

feel any comfort of it. And in this reſpect it may be ſaid, that Chriſt ſuffered that death, wherewith God in wrath doth ſtrike wicked doers, though in other reſpects there was great difference.

Obj. 17. *Calvin* is charged with this ſaying, *In the death of Chriſt occurs a ſpectacle full of deſperation.*

Anſw. *Calvins* meaning will eaſily appear to any that look upon his words as they are in the place quoted. He ſpeaks of *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* his courage in begging of *Pilate* Chriſts body to bury it, ſaying, *Now when in Chriſts death occurs a ſpectacle full of deſperation, which might have been able to break a ſtout heart, whence hath he on the ſudden ſuch a generous ſpirit, that in the midſt of terrors fearing nothing, he ſhould not doubt to proceed further then when all was quiet?* Any may here plainly ſee, that *Calvin* ſpeaks not of any deſperation that Chriſt in his death did fall into; but his meaning is, that a natural man, yea one that had but a ſmall meaſure of faith, could have apprehended nothing in Chriſts death but matter of deſperation. And ſurely this appears by the words of the two Diſciples (not to ſpeak of the deportment of the Apoſtles) *We truſted that it had been he that ſhould have redeemed Iſrael*, Luke 24.21.

Nunc dum in Chriſti morte ſpectaculum deſperationis plenum occurrit, quod etiam viriles animos frangere poſſet, unde illi repertè tam generoſa animoſitas, ut inter ſummos terrores nihil metuens, longiùs quàm rebus pacatis progredi non dubitet? *Calv. in Mat.*27.57.

Another ſentence is here immediately after cited out of *Calvin*, viz. *In this ſpectacle there was nothing but matter of extreme deſpair.* The very words ſhew it to carry the ſame ſenſe with the former, though otherwiſe I can ſay nothing to it, the place from which it is taken being miſ-cited; for on *Joh.*14.6 *Calvin* hath no ſuch thing.

Obj. 18. The Marqueſſe taxeth *Calvin* for ſaying, *Chriſt ſitting at the right hand of his Father, holds but a ſecond degree with him in honour, and rule, and is but his Vicar.*

Anſw. *Calvin* on *Mat.*26.64. doth ſay, That *Chriſt is ſaid to ſit at the right hand of the Father, becauſe he hath as it were after him the ſecond ſeat of honour and rule; and becauſe he is his*

Dicitur autem Chriſtus ſedere ad dextram Patris, quia ſummus rex conſtitutus (qui ejus nomine mundum gubernat) quaſi ſecundam ab eo honoris & imperii ſedem obtinet. Sedet ergo Chriſtus ad Patris dextram, quia ejus eſt Vicarius. *Calv. ad Mat.*26.64

Vicar.

Vicar. So that *Calvin* indeed doth not ſay, that *Chriſt ſitting at the right hand of his Father*; but, that *Chriſt as ſitting at the right hand of his Father, holds but a ſecond degree*, &c. that is, that Chriſts ſitting at the right hand of God, though it import great honour and dignity, yet ſuch, as whereby Chriſt is but in a ſecond degree of honour under the Father. And ſurely this is moſt true, it belonging unto Chriſt as man, to ſit at the right hand of God, (as the Councel of *Trents* Catechiſme doth teach) the honour and diguity which that ſitting imports, though otherwiſe it be moſt great, yet muſt needs be inferior to that, which belongs to the Father and ſo alſo to Chriſt, as he is one and the ſame God with the Father.

Ad explicandum Chriſti gloriam, quam ut homo præ cæteris omnibus adeptus eſt, eum in Patris dextrâ eſſe confitemur. *Catechiſ. Concil. Trident.*

19. *Laſtly* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *Calvin holds it abſurd, that Chriſt ſhould challenge to himſelf the glory of his own reſurrection, when the Scripture every where teacheth it to be the work of the Father.* *Obj.*

It may ſeem wonderful, that mens words and writings ſhould be thus depraved. Two places of *Calvin* are cited for proof of this which is alleadged againſt him. Now in the former place, *viz.* on *Joh.*2.19. he ſaith thus. *Here Chriſt doth challenge to himſelf the glory of his reſurrection, when as the Scripture uſually doth teſtifie that this is the work of God the Father. But theſe two do well agree together. For the Scripture, to commend unto us Gods power, doth expreſly aſcribe this to the Father, that he raiſed his Son from the dead: but here Chriſt peculiarly ſets forth his own Divinity. And* Paul *doth reconcile both*, Rom. 8. 11. *For the Spirit, which he maketh to be the Author of the reſurrection, he promiſcuouſly cals ſometimes the Spirit of Chriſt, ſometimes the Spirit of the Father.* So alſo in the other place, *viz.* on *Rom.*8.11. *Surely* (ſaith he) *Chriſt roſe again of himſelf, and by his own power: But* *Anſw*

Hîc ſibi Chriſtus reſurrectionis gloriam vendicat, quum tamen Scriptura paſſim teſtetur eſſe opus Dei Patris. Sed hæc duo probè inter ſe conveniunt. Scriptura enim, ut Dei potentiam nobis commendet, Patri hoc diſertè adſcribit, quòd excitaverit Filium à morte: hîc verò Chriſtus peculiariter Divinitatem ſuam prædicat. Ac Paulus utrumque conciliat ad *Rom.*8.11. nam Spiritum, quem facit reſurrectionis authorem, promiſcuè nunc Chriſti, nunc Patris Spiritum nominat. *Calv. ad Joh.* 2.19.

A ſeipſo certè ac propriâ virtute Chriſtus reſurrexit: Sed quemadmodum

Solet Patri transcribere quicquid in se divinæ virtutis est, ita Apostolus non impropriè ad Patrem transtulit quod fuit in Christo maximè proprium opus. *Calv. ad Rom.* 8.11.

as he used to transcribe to the Father whatsoever divine power is in him, so the Apostle doth not improperly transferre to the Father that which was Christs most proper work. Who doth not now see, that *Calvin* is most farre from saying that, which is charged upon him?

Obj. 20. But the Marquesse (notwithstanding the word *lastly* did seem to speak as much) hath not yet done with *Calvin*: but further taxeth him for saying, *God is author of all those things, which these Popish Judges would have to happen by his idle sufferance.*

Answ. *Calvin* in the place cited, not barely saith that it is so, but saith that he hath plainly shewed by Scripture that it is so. And therefore it had been meet that *Calvins* proofs should have been examined, before his doctrine were condemned. *Calvin* abhorres that position, that God is the author of sinne; as may be seen in the very next Section to that which the Marquesse citeth: Yet he proveth by many places of Scripture, that God doth not onely permit those things wherein men sinne, but also in some respect is the author of them: As for example, that God was the author of *Shimei's* cursing; not as it was his sinne, but as it was *Davids* affliction. So *David* acknowledged, saying, *The* LORD *hath said unto him, curse David*, 2 Sam. 16. 10. And again, *v.* 11. *The* LORD *hath bidden him.*

Et jam satis apertè ostendi, Deum vocari eorum omnium authorem, quæ isti censores volunt otioso tantùm ejus permissu contingere. *Calv. Instit. l.* 1. *c.* 18. *s.* 3.

Obj. 21. The next and last charge against *Calvin*, is little or nothing different from that immediately preceding, *viz.* that he saith, *Our sinnes are not only by Gods * permission, but by his decree and will.*

* It is misprinted, *commission.*

Answ. The Marquesse speaks of *Calvins* famous brethren condemning this blasphemy. But they, whom he mentioneth, are (I think) all *Lutherans*, and so ready to make the worst they can of any thing that they finde in *Calvin*. But whereas in the conclusion he saith, *What Scriptures or Fathers is*

there

there for all this? Surely *Calvin* hath alleadged many Scriptures for that which he asserteth; which it had been meet to take some notice of, as I have said before. He also cites *Austine* determining thus, *That men sinne, it is of themselves; but that by sinning they doe this or that, it is by the power of God, who divideth the darknesse as he pleaseth.*

Quòd autem nihil efficiant homines nisi arcano Dei nutu, &c. innumeris & claris testimoniis probatur, *Calv. Inst. l. 1. c. 18. sect. 1.* Non male alicubi Augustinus ita definit, quòd ipsi peccant, eorum esse; quod peccando hoc vel illud agant, ex virtute Dei esse, tenebras prout visum est dividentis. *Calvin. Instit. lib. 2. cap. 4. sect. 4.*

And thus have I also answered those things that are in point of Doctrine objected against *Calvin.*

After *Calvin* the Marquesse deals with *Zuinglius*, and objects divers things against his Doctrine. *Of* Zuinglius *his Doctrine*

1. *Zuinglius* (saith the Marquesse) *confesseth himself to have been instructed against the Masse, by a certain admoniſher, which he knew not, whether it was black or white.* *Obj.* *Page* 184. *&c.*

It is true, *Zuinglius* relates, how having disputed with a Scribe about the meaning of those words, *This is my body*; and having been urged to produce some place, which is not a parable, where the word *is* doth import as much as *signifieth*, he was much troubled about it in his sleep, and thought that one (whether black or white, he could not remember) stood by him, and bade him alleadge that in Exod. 12. 11. *It is the Lords Passeover.* Whereupon he awaked, and rose, and considered the place, and presently after preached upon it, so that such as did a little stick before, were fully satisfied. *Answ.*

Visus sum mihi in somno, multo cum tædio denuo contendere cum adversario Scriba, &c. (nihil altius quam somnium narramus, quod ad nos attinet, tametsi leve non est, quod per somnium didicimus, gratia Deo, &c.) Ibi ἀπὸ μηχανῆς visus est monitor adesse (ater fuerit, an albus, nihil memini; somnium enim narro.) qui diceret, Quin ignave, respondes ei, quod Exo. 12. scribitur, Est enim Phase, h. e. transitus Domini. Protinus ut hoc phasma visum est, simul expergefio, &c *Zuingl. tom. 2. fol. 249.*

Now though Mr. *Breerley*, and after him the Marquesse make a great matter of this, and say that is derided by learned Protestants (they cite some *Lutherans*, as great adversaries to *Zuinglius* in the matter of the Sacrament, as the Papists are) yet I see nothing in it that is liable to any just exception. For it is usuall with men to be troubled in their sleep about that wherein they have been busied before; and Breerl. *Apol. tract. 2. cap. 2. sect. 11. subdivis. 2.*

ſometimes it happens, that in their ſleep that is repreſented unto them, which before with all their ſtudy they could not finde out. As *Auſtine* ſomewhere (I do not now remember the place, but I have read it in him) tels of one that taught Rhetorick, and being troubled about the meaning of ſomething that he met with, and was to treat of to his Schollars, in his ſleep he thought that *Auſtine* did explain it unto him. But that which here they take hold of, perhaps is this, that *Zuinglius* ſaith, he did not know whether his admoniſher were black or white; they ſeem to underſtand this ſo, as if he knew not whether that admoniſher were an evill, or a good ſpirit. But if they ſo take it, they bewray too much ignorance of the Latine tongue, wherein it is uſual, and indeed a proverbial ſpeech to ſay, *I know not whether he be black or white*; that is, he is one altogether unknown unto me. *Eraſmus* in his Adages ſufficiently ſhews this to be the meaning of the words, and cites *Cicero*, *Quintilian*, *Apuleius*, *Hierome*, uſing them in this ſenſe.

Albus an arer ſis, neſcio. Solet dici de homine vehementer ignoto. *Eraſ. Adag. cent. 6. adag. 99.*

Obj. 2. The Marqueſſe ſaith that *Zuinglius is taxed by Calvin for depraving the Scripture, for changing the word* eſt, *and putting in* ſignificat, *in his Tranſlation of the New Teſtament.*

Anſw. But the Marqueſſe doth not tell us, where *Calvin* doth thus taxe *Zuinglius*; and I ſuſpect that there is ſome miſtake in that word *Calvin*, and that it ſhould be ſome other name.

Obj. 3. Hee chargeth *Zuinglius* with ſaying, that theſe ſayings, and the like, *If thou wilt enter into life, keepe the Commandements, &c.* are ſuperfluous, and hyperbolical.

Anſw. But in the place alleadged, viz. *Tom.* 1. *Fol.* 137. *Zuinglius* hath no ſuch matter, there is no mention made of thoſe words, *If thou wilt enter into life, &c.*

Obj. 4. *Zuinglius* is taxed for ſaying, that *Original ſinne* * *cannot damne us*; *calling it but a diſeaſe, or contagion.*

* *It is miſprinted* can damn us.

Anſw. It is true, *Zuinglius* ſaith, that Original ſin is a diſeaſe, but ſuch

ſuch an one as of it ſelfe is not capable, nor can infer damnation, except a man being corrupted with this contagion tranſgreſſe the Law of God, which then uſeth to happen, when he ſees and underſtands the Law given unto him. And in this I plead not for *Zuinglius*, I confeſſe he erred, and is worthy to be taxed. But Ido not know any Proteſtants that do ſecond him in this; I ſpeak not of *Socinians*, *Arminians*, &c. but ſuch as are otherwiſe ſound and orthodox. Neither ſhould the Romaniſts here ſo much taxe *Zuinglius*, ſeeing they hold that Concupiſcence after Baptiſme, though it remain the ſame that it was before, is in it ſelf properly no ſinne, but is onely called ſinne, becauſe it proceeds from ſinne, and inclines unto ſinne. Yea they hold, that had man been created (as they ſuppoſe he might have been) in his pure naturals, that is, in a meer natural condition, not having any ſupernatural grace ſuperadded to his nature, he ſhould have had the ſame concupiſcence, which now he hath in the ſtate of corrupt nature. The ſtate of man ſince the fall of *Adam* (they ſay) doth not differ more from the ſtate of man in his pure naturals, then one that is ſtripped of his cloaths differs from one that is naked, having never had cloaths. And therefore (they ſay) the corruption of mans nature doth not proceed from the want of any natural gift, nor from the acceſſe of any evill quality, &c. Its true, ſome of the Romiſh writers are of another opinion; but *Bellarmine* ſhews that the moſt of them hold thus; yea he alleadges, that this is the determination of two Popes, and that therefore all ought to hold it.

Unde colligimus, peccatum originale morbum quidem eſſe, qui tamen per ſe culpabilis non eſt, nec damnationis pœnam inferre poteſt, &c. donec homo contagione hâc corruptus Legem Dei tranſgreditur, quod tum demum fieri conſuevit, cum Legem ſibi poſitam videt, & intelligit. *Zuingl. de Bap. tom. 2 fol. 90.*

Some endeavor to excuſe Zuinglius *in this, but I ſee not how he can be excuſed.*

Bellar. de amiſ. grat. & ſtat. peccat. lib. 5. cap. 7.

Bellar. de grat. primi hom. cap. 5.

Quarè non magis differt ſtatus hominis poſt lapſum Adæ à ſtatu ejuſdem in puris naturalibus, quàm differt ſpoliatus à nudo. —— Proinde corruptio naturæ non ex alicujus doni naturalis carentiâ, neque ex alicujus malæ qualitatis acceſſu, ſed ex ſolâ doni ſupernaturalis ob Adæ peccatum amiſſione perfluxit. *Bell. ibid.*

Bell. ibid.

5. *Zuinglius* is ſaid to make baptizing of Infants a thing indifferent, which may be uſed or left off. *Obj.*

Zuinglius complains of the *Catabaptiſts* in his time, for keeping ſuch a ſtirre becauſe children were baptized, *Anſw.*

Num tanti momenti res hæc est, ut tantas turbas & dissidia propter hanc excitare conveniat, etiamsi parvulorum baptismus nullis omnino Scripturarum testimoniis inniteretur? externum quiddam est, & ceremoniale, quo ut aliis rebus externis, ecclesia dignè & honestè uti potest, vel idem hoc omittere, & rite tollere, quatenus ipsi ad ædificationem & salutem omnium facere videtur. *Zuingl. de Baptis. tom. 2. fol. 96.*

saying, That the matter was not of such moment, as that there should be so much stir about it, though there were no testimonies at all to prove it. It is (he saith) an external thing, and ceremonial, which as other external things, the Church may lawfully either use, or omit, as she sees it make for edification and salvation. Here *Zuinglius* seems only to mean thus much, that the Church for avoiding of tumults and combustions, may for a while forbear the administration of Pedobaptisme. Yet *Zuinglius* was far from holding the baptizing of children to be a thing indifferent: For he saith, that it succeeded in the room of Circumcision; And that to hinder children from receiving Baptisme, is as much as to repel them from Christ.

Baptismum in Circumcisionis locum successisse, abundè satis demonstratum est. *Zuingl. ibid. fol. 95.*

Probibere ne baptismi signum infantes accipiant, quid aliud est, quàm eosdem à Christo repellere? *Ibid. fol. 86.*

Obj. 6. *Zuinglius* is censured for saying, That *Princes may be deposed by the godly, if they be wicked, and go contrary to the rule of Christ.*

Answ. I grant that *Zuinglius* hath words to this purpose. But (as a learned Writer observes) *Zuinglius* living in a Republick, did not sufficiently consider the Laws and rights of Kingdomes. He thought that all Kingdomes were elective, none successive and hereditary, which was his errour. And hereupon, that they, to whom belonged the right of election, did reserve this power to themselves, that if the King did not keepe his oath, but did rule tyrannically; they might depose him. *Zuinglius* also (in the place cited by the Marquesse) hath these words, (which also the forementioned Authour doth relate)

Id ex toto illo tractatu constat, Zuinglium in eâ sententia fuisse, regna omnia esse electiva, nulla proprie successiva, & hæreditaria; in quo non negamus eum errasse in facto, ut loquuntur; contrarium enim nobis certum est: sed vivebat ille in republicâ, in quâ regnorum jura non satis expenderat. Hoc igitur posito fundamento, existimavit eos, ad quos jus electionis pertinebat, illud sibi etiam reservasse, ut si Rex vel Princeps electus, non staret juramento suo, sed repub. pessum ire sineret & tyrannicè gubernaret, tum etiam possent talem Principem deponere, *&c.* — Quid mirum si ita senserit Helvetius, *&c. Rivet. Jes. vap. cap. 13 sect. 8.*

Non est quòd eum trucides, nec ut bellum & tumultum quis excitet,

excitet, ſed aliis viis res tentanda; quia in pace vocavit nos Deus, 1 Cor. 7. that is, *Thou muſt not kill him, nor muſt any raiſe warre or tumult, but the matter muſt be attempted ſome other way; for God hath called us in peace,* 1 Cor. 7. Concerning *Zuinglius* his opinion in this point, ſee likewiſe B. *Bilſon* in his book entituled, *The true difference betwixt Chriſtian ſubjection, and Antichriſtian rebellion,* pag. 513, &c. But when the Romaniſts taxe *Zuinglius*, and ſo other Proteſtant writers for ſuch doctrine, what do they elſe but verifie that of the Poet, *Clodius accuſat mœchos, Catalina Cethegum?* What do they elſe but tax others for that, wherein themſelves are moſt faulty? See B. *Bilſ. ibid.* p. 425, &c. & *Rivet. Jeſ. vap. cap.* 12.

Obj. 7. In the laſt place, *Zuinglius* is charged with this ſaying, That *when we commit adultery, or murder, it is the work of God, being the mover, the author, or inciter,* &c. *God moveth the thief to kill,* &c. *he is forced to ſinne,* &c.

Anſw. That learned Proteſtant, viz. *Grawerus*, by whom (the Marqueſſe ſaith) *Zuinglius* is reprehended for this, was a *Lutheran*, and ſo as ready to reprehend any thing in *Zuinglius* as they of the Church of *Rome* are. But let *Zuinglius* ſpeak for himſelf. *The Law* (ſaith he) *being given unto man, he alwayes ſinnes, when he doth any thing againſt the Law; although he neither is, nor lives, nor works, but in God, from God, and by God. But that which God worketh by man, is reckoned as a fault in man, but not in God. For man is under a law, but God is free,* &c. *Therefore one and the ſame act, to wit, adultery or murder, as it is of God the author, mover and inciter, ſo it is no crime: but as it is of man, ſo it is a crime and a wickedneſſe. For God is not bound by any law; but man is even condemned by the Law.* Here *Zuinglius* teacheth no other doctrine then (as I have ſhewed before) *Aquinas* doth, and no learned Romaniſt (I am ſure) will gainſay, viz. that God is the author of that which is ſinne in man, as adultery, or murther; yet not as it is ſinne, viz. an irregularity and ſwerving from

Cum lex homini eſt data, ſemper peccat, cum contra legem facit, quamvis nec ſit, nec vivat, nec operetur niſi in Deo, ex Deo, & per Deum. Sed quod Deus operatur per hominem, homini vitio vertitur, non etiam Deo; hic enim ſub lege eſt, ille liber, &c. Unum igitur atque idem facinus, puta adulterium aut homicidium, quantum Dei authoris, motoris, ac impulſoris opus eſt, crimen non eſt; quantum autem hominis eſt, crimen ac ſcelus eſt. Ille enim lege non tenetur, hic autem lege etiam damnatur. *Zuing. de Provid. tom.* 1. *fol.* 365.

from the Law, but only as it is an action, and hath ſome entity or being in it. Whereas he ſpeaks of Gods forcing man to ſinne, though I do not like the expreſſion, yet it is but like to that which *Bellarmine* (whoſe words I cited before) uſeth, when he ſaith that God doth bend and wreſt the wills of wicked men. The meaning of them both, I ſuppoſe, is, that God by his over-ruling providence doth ſo order it, that though (as was alſo cited before out of *Auſtin*) men do wickedly of themſelves, yet he maketh them to do this rather then that, as he pleaſeth.

Permitto coactum eſſe, &c. Zuing. ibid. p. 366.

Of Melanchthons *Doctrine.* *Pag.* 85.

The Marqueſſe now comes to *Melanchthon*, and his doctrine. And 1. he chargeth him with teaching, that there are three Divinities, as there are three Perſons.

Obj.

Anſw.

Stancarus, whom the Marqueſſe cites as reprehending *Melanchthon* for this, was *Melanchthons* adverſary, and therefore his teſtimony in this caſe is of no weight. But the Marqueſſe alſo cites *Melanchthons* Common-Places, *an.* 1545. Now in *Melanchthons* Works ſet forth in four Volumes at *Wittemberge*, *an.* 1580. in the *Index* of the Books contained in the firſt Volume, the laſt Edition of thoſe Common-Places is ſaid to have been in the year 1545. though afterwards where the Common-Places themſelves are exhibited, the laſt Edition of them is ſaid to have been *an.* 1543. But thus it ſeems the laſt Edition was at leaſt *an.* 1545. if not before. Now it is not probable, that if ſuch a groſſe error had ſlipt from *Melanchthon*, in his Common-Places, it would have been in the laſt Edition of them. However, I find no ſuch thing in them, as is alleadged, but the quite contrary, viz. *Una eſt æterna Eſſentia divina*; that is, *There is one eternal divine Eſſence.* And again, *Sunt tres Perſonæ Divinitatis*, that is, *There are three Perſons of the Divinity.* So that *Melanchthon* doth acknowledge but one Divinity, though three Divine Perſons.

Locorum Theologicorum poſtrema Editio abſoluta anno 1545.

Locorum Theologicorum poſtrema Editio abſoluta Wittembergæ anno 1543.

Obj.

Anſw.

2. The Marqueſſe ſaith, That he affirms Polygamie not to be againſt *Jus divinum*, and adviſeth *Hen.* 8. to it.

I find no ſuch peece among *Melanchthons* Works, as *Concil. Theol.* which the Marqueſſe citeth to make good this accuſation.

ſation. But I finde *Examen Theologicum*, and in it the contrary to this, which *Melanchon* is here charged with. *Wee have ſeen many* (ſaith he) *who did neglect the uſual Lawes of Marriages, becauſe we read how of old they had many wives, and* Jacob *married two ſiſters. But we muſt judge not by examples, but by Laws; and in a matter of ſuch moment as this, let Gods precepts be conſidered. It is moſt certain, that the firſt Law of Marriage was ſo eſtabliſhed, that one man, and one woman ſhould be joyned together. --- The Son of God doth draw us back to the firſt inſtitution,* &c.

Vidimus etiam multos, qui uſitatas leges connubiorum ideò negligebant, quod leguntur diſſimilia veterum exempla de polygamiâ, & de conjugiis Jacobi, qui duas ſorores duxit, Non eſt autem exemplis, ſed legibus judicandum, & in hâc tantâ re conſiderentur præcepta divina. Certiſſimum eſt, legem conjugii primam ita ſancitam eſſe, ut unius maris, & unius fœminæ conjunctio eſſet. --- Filius Dei nos ad primam inſtitutionem retrahit, &c. *Melanch. tom. 1. fol. 339.*

3. He is ſaid to teach peremptory reſiſtance againſt Magiſtrates; and to inable the inferiour Magiſtrate to alter Religion againſt the contrary Edicts of the Superiour. *Obj.*

For the latter part of this charge the Marqueſſe citeth *Concil. Theol.* which book I finde not (as I ſaid) amongſt *Melanchons* Works. For the former part, he citeth *Melanchon* on *Rom.* 13. but in that place there is not a ſyllable (that I can ſee) whereby it may appear, that *Melanchon* teacheth any reſiſtance againſt the Magiſtrate. All that I finde is, that he teacheth Magiſtracie to be of God, and anſwereth the arguments of the *Anabaptiſts* againſt it. *Anſw.*

Here the Marqueſſe addes, So *Calvin*, ſo *Beza*, ſo *Goodman*, ſo *Danæus*, ſo *Knox*, &c. *all hold it lawfull to depoſe, murther, or to arraign their Prince*, &c. But where theſe Authours, either all or any of them do hold thus, he ſheweth not, he doth not ſo much as point at any of their writings where ſuch doctrine may be found. I know that ſome of theſe Authours here mentioned, are charged in this kinde by Romiſh Writers; but withall I know that the charges brought againſt them are anſwered. See *Rivet. Jeſ. Vap. cap.* 13. § 9. 10, 11. *Biſ. of Chriſt. ſubject.* Page 509. &c. The former of theſe anſwers to what is alleadged againſt *Calvin*; the latter, to what is alleadged both againſt him, and againſt *Beza*, *Goodman*, and *Knox*. But ſome of the Authours, whom the Marqueſſe here citeth, as being of this opinion concerning Magiſtrates,

To this purpose doth the Marqueſſe himſelf cite Mr. *Bancroft*, page 203.

he was much miſtaken in, viz. *Bancroft*, who did declare himſelf ſo much the other way, that he taxed ſome of theſe here mentioned by the Marqueſſe, as being not reſpective enough of the honour due to Magiſtrates. His book I have read, though now I have it not; nor do I perfectly remember the title of it. I think alſo that there is the like miſtake concerning *Sutcliffe*, whom the Marqueſſe alſo joyneth with the reſt; I thinke that he alſo was ſo farre from teaching ſuch doctrine, that he did rather taxe thoſe, who did but ſeem to teach it. But I am not ſo well aſſured of him, as of the other.

Of *Andræas Muſculus* his doctrine. Page 86.

After *Melanchthon* the Marqueſſe ſpeaketh of *Andræas Muſculus*, who (he ſaith) was not afraid openly to teach, that the Divine nature of Chriſt died upon the Croſſe with his humane nature.

Anſw.

Wolfangus Muſculus is an Author well known; but *Andræas Muſculus*, I confeſſe, I have not heard of before, ſo farre am I from being able to ſay what he holdeth: but if he hold, as the Marqueſſe here alleadgeth, I ſhall be as ready to explode and abhor his opinion, as any other.

Pag. 86. &c. The diviſions of Proteſtants.

In the next place the Marqueſſe ſpeaketh of the diviſions of Proteſtants, which (I confeſſe) have been, and are too great; though divers of the Sects which he mentioneth, I do not know that ever I read of before. But what if Proteſtants differ among themſelves, and ſo muſt needs ſome of them be in error? Yet may they for all this be in the truth ſo far forth as they all agree, and conſequently ſo far forth as they diſſent from the Church of *Rome*. There were many Sects among the *Jews*, as *Phariſees*, *Sadduces*, and *Herodians*, ſpoken of in Scripture, and the *Eſſenes* mentioned by *Joſephus*. Theſe differing one from another, muſt certainly ſome of them erre; yet as they agreed together in oppoſing Paganiſme, they were all right.

Page 87.

Whilſt the Catholicks (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *have no jars, no differences uncompoſed, having one common Father, one Conductor and Adviſer, as Sir* Edw. Sands *confeſſeth.*

Anſw.

The Authours book, which the Marqueſſe citeth, I have, but not ſo diſtinguiſhed as that which he referreth unto,

and

and therefore I cannot finde the words which he alleadgeth. But seeing mention is made of this book, I think it meet here to insert some things out of it, that so the Reader may perceive what manner of unity and agreement it is that is amongst them of the Church of *Rome*. *But now* (saith that worthy Authour) *to come to the view of their Ecclesiastical government, not so much as it is referred to the conduct of soules, though that be the natural and proper end of that regiment, but rather as it is addressed to the upholding of the worldly power and glory of their order, to the advancing of their part, and overthrow of their opposites, which I suppose be the points they now chiefly respect; I think, I may truly say, there was never yet State framed by mans wit in this world more powerful and forcible to work those effects; never any either more wisely contrived, and plotted, or more constantly and diligently put in practice and execution: insomuch that but for the natural weaknesse, and untruth, and dishonesty, which being rotten at the heart abate the force of whatsoever is founded thereon, their outward means were sufficient to subdue a whole world. --- In their art they have certain head-assertions, which as indemonstrable principles they urge all to receive and hold; As, That they are the Church of God, within which great facility, and without which no possibility of salvation. That divine Prerogative granted to them above all other Societies in the world, doth preserve them everlastingly from erring in matter of faith, and from falling from God: That the Pope Christs deputy, hath the keyes of heaven in his custody, &c. In these points no doubt or question is tolerable; and who so joyn with them in these, shall finde great connivence in what other defect or difference soever, &c. And by this plot they have erected in the world a Monarchy more potent then ever any that hath been before it, &c.* And afterward, *To what a miserable push* (saith he) *have they driven the world, either in their pleading against them with such force of evidence, or in their learning of them, and joyning with them, as to stop the mouth of the one, and bang the faith of the other on this unnatural paradox, I and my Church cannot possibly erre, and this must you take upon our own words to be true. For as for their conjectural evidence out of the Scripture, there seems to be as much, or more for the King of* Spains *not erring, as there is for the Popes, it being said by the wisest, that the heart of the King is in the hands of God, a divine*

Sir *Edward Sand's Europæ Spec.* p. 23. &c.

Of the unity that is in the Church of *Rome*.

Page 202. & 203.

ſentence is in his lips, and his mouth ſhall not tranſgreſſe in judge-
Page 204. & 205. *ment.* And a little after: *Although it were perhaps not untruly ſaid by a great Clerk of their own, that the Popes not erring was but an opinion of policy, and not of Theologie; to give ſtay to the Laity, not ſtop to the Divines, of whom in ſuch infinite controverſies and jarrings* (NB) *about interpretations of Texts, and concluſions of Science, wherein many have ſpent a large part of their lives, never any yet went, neither at this day doth go to be reſolved by the Pope, as knowing it to be true, which their own Law delivereth, that in holineſſe any old woman, in knowledge many a Friar might out-go the Pope, but in power and authority the whole world was under him; yet at this day they do ſo generally cling to him, and draw by his line (as having no hope either of ſtanding againſt their oppoſites, but onely by him, or of unity among themſelves, but onely in him) that touch him,*
Page 114. &c. *and touch them,* &c. And elſewhere in the ſame book, *It is a wonderful thing* (ſaith he) *to ſee what curious order and diligence they uſe to ſuffer nothing to be done, or ſpring up among themſelves, which may any way give footing to the Religion which they ſo much hate. And firſt for the Scriptures, for as much as the Reformation ſeems grounded upon them,* &c. *though as well to beat back the irkſome out-cries of their adverſaries, as alſo to give ſome ſatisfaction to their own, that they might not think them ſo terribly afraid of the Bible, they were content to let it be tranſlated by ſome of their favourers into the vulgar, as alſo ſome number of Copies to be ſaleable a while at the beginning; yet ſince having huſhed that former clamor, and made better proviſion for the eſtabliſhing of their Kingdome, they have called all vulgar Bibles ſtreightly in again (yea the very Pſalms of* David, *which their famous Preacher B.* Panigarola *tranſlated) as doubting elſe the unavoidableneſſe of thoſe former inconveniences. --- Neither yet in their very Sermons, though they preach alwayes in a manner on the Goſpel of the day, do they read, or any other wayes recite the Text, but diſcourſe onely on ſuch points of it as they think fitteſt, without more ſolemnity; that no ſound of Scripture may poſſeſſe the people; although the uſe in* France *be otherwiſe for that matter. Yea ſome parts of Scripture, as S.* Pauls *Epiſtles, they are ſo jealous of, and think ſo dangerous, that by report of divers (for my ſelf did not hear it) ſome of their Jeſuits of late in* Italy *in ſolemn Sermon, and other their favourites elſewhere in private communi-*

cation,

communication, commending between them S. Peter for a worthy spirit, have censured S. Paul for a hot-headed person, who was transported so with his pangs of zeal and eagernesse beyond all compasse in sundry his disputes, that there was no great reckoning to be made of his assertions; yea he was dangerous to read, as savouring of heresie in some places, and better he had not written of those matters at all. Agreeable to which I have heard other of their Catholicks deliver, that it hath been heretofore very seriously consulted among them, to have censured by some means, and reformed the writings of S. Paul; though for mine own part I must professe I can hardly believe this, as being an attempt too too abominable and blasphemous, and for these times too desperate a scandal. But howsoever, he of all others is least beholding to them, whom, of mine own knowledge and hearing, some of them teach in the Pulpit not to have been secure of his preaching, but by conference with St. Peter, and other of the Apostles; nor that he durst publish his Epistles till they had allowed them. — And as in the foundation of the Reformation, which is the Scripture, so much more in the edifice it self, the doctrine and opinions, they beat away all sound and eccho of them, being not lawfull there to alleadge them, no not to glance at them, not to argue & dispute of them, no not to refute them. In ordinary communication to talk of matter of Religion, is odious and suspicious: but to enter into any reasoning, though but for argument sake without other scandal, is prohibited and dangerous. Yea it was once my fortune to be half threatned for no other fault then for debating with a Jew, and upholding the truth of Christianity against him: so unlawfull are all disputes of Religion whatsoever. And their Friars even in France, in their endeavours to convert others, will say it is lawfull to perswade them, but not so to dispute with them. But in Italy this is much more exactly observed, &c. — But the most strange thing, as to me it seemed of all other, is, that those principal Writers, who have employed themselves wholly in resuting from point to point the Protestants doctrine and arguments, are so rare in Italy, as by ordinary enquiry, I beleeve, not to be found. The controversies of Cardinal Bellarmine I sought for in Venice in all places. Neither that, nor Gregory of Valentia, nor any of such quality could I ever in any Shop of Italy set eye on: but in instead of them an infinite number of meer invectives and declamations: which made me entertaine this suspicious conjecture, that it might be their care that no part of the

Paul, and his writings censured by the Jesuits, and others of the Church of *Rome*.

Reasoning about matter of Religion not suffered in the Church of *Rome*, nor scarce to talk of it.

Bellarmine and such like Writers scarce to be found in *Italy*.

the Proteſtants poſitions and allegations ſhould be known, they were ſo exact, as to make diſcurrent in ſome ſort even thoſe very books, which were conſtrained to recite them, that they might refute them, &c. By theſe and other paſſages in that book, which the Marqueſſe was pleaſed to cite, we may ſee what a politique, indeed, yet withall a poor and pittiful Unity that is, which is amongſt them of the Church of *Rome*, though the Marqueſſe here (as alſo before about the begining of his Reply) doth ſo boaſt of it.

Page 87, &c. But the Marqueſſe begins again to fall upon Proteſtant writers, and to inveigh againſt them, as guilty of *ſtrange and unheard of blaſphemies, vileneſſe and wickedneſſe.* And as if the teſtimonies which he alleadgeth for proof hereof, were not to be doubted of, he ſaith, that they are the teſtimonies of Proteſtants themſelves, and not of any of the Church of *Rome*. But the moſt of his teſtimonies are thoſe of *Luther* and his followers, concerning *Zuinglius* and thoſe that joined with him; or the teſtimonies of theſe concerning the other. Now theſe being adverſaries one to the other, as the Romaniſts are to them both, the teſtimonies of the one againſt the other are to be accounted no more valid, then if the teſtimonies of the Romaniſts had been alleadged againſt them. Mr: *Breerley* premoniſheth him, that ſhall undertake to anſwer his *Apologie*, to forbear to urge the teſtimonies of ſuch, as perſiſted profeſſed enemies to the Roman See, and alſo of thoſe, who though but for a time, did ſtand in ſome oppoſition againſt it. Yet himſelf (and from him the Marqueſſe) uſually doth urge the teſtimonies of thoſe, who were profeſſed adverſaries to them, againſt whom they are urged. But waving thoſe particulars which are founded upon ſuch teſtimonies (as indeed the moſt are) there are ſome other, to which I ſhall endeavour to give anſwer.

In his Advertiſement.

Of *Luther's* conference with the Devil. *Luth. de Miſſ. privat. & uncl. ſacerdot. tom.* 7. *fol.* 228, &c.

1. It is objected, *That* Luther *was taught by the Devil, that the Maſſe was naught; and overcome with the Devils reaſons, he aboliſht it.*

Anſ. It is true, *Luther* himſelf doth at large relate, how that about midnight when he awaked, the Devil did diſpute with him, and convince him, that the Maſſe, which for many years

years he had celebrated, was evil and unlawful, as being moſt repugnant to Chriſts inſtitution. This many of the Romiſh writers upbraid him with, as if the Maſſe muſt needs therfore be good, becauſe the Devil did plead againſt it, & Proteſtants make uſe of thoſe very arguments which the Devil did urge in his diſpute with *Luther*. But though the Devil be a liar, and hath alwayes ſome evil and falſe end at which he aims, yet the thing it ſelf which he ſaith is not alwayes falſe. For he confeſſed Chriſt to be the Son of God, *Mat.* 8. 29. and *Paul* and his companions to be the ſervants of the moſt high God, which did ſhew the way of ſalvation, *Act.* 16. 17. Neither do I ſee any reaſon, why *Luther* might not come to ſee his error, and to correct it, by the Devils diſpute with him, though the Devil intended no ſuch matter; as well as *Monica*, *Auſtin's* mother, came to ſee her vice and to abandon it, by being upbraided with it by one, whoſe intent was nothing leſſe then to work ſuch an effect upon her. *Aug. confeſſ. lib. 9. cap. 8.* Mr. *Breerley* will not admit, that the Devil in that diſpute did ſeek to drive *Luther* to deſpaire: But *Luther*, whom any indifferent man will rather believe in this caſe, did judge otherwiſe of it. *It is true* (ſaith he) *the Devil is a liar, but an artificial liar; his lies are more cunning and crafty, then man is able to imagine. He layes hold on ſome clear truth that cannot be denied, and doth urge it ſo ſubtilly, and doth ſo varniſh his lie, as to deceive even thoſe that are moſt wary. As that thought which he put into* Judas, *was true*, I have betraied innocent blood: *this* Judas *could not deny. But this was a lie*; Therfore I muſt deſpair of Gods mercy. *Yet did the Devil bring him to this. Therefore when the Devil doth urge the greatneſſe of ſinne, he doth not lie: but herein he lieth, that he would make me to deſpair of Gods grace. I confeſſed (being convinced by the law of God) before the Devil, that* I *ſinned*; *but with* Peter *I turn me unto Chriſt*, &c.

Verum quidem eſt, quòd mendax ſit (ſc. diabolus) ſed ejus mendacia non ſunt ſimplicis artificis, ſed longè callidiora & inſtructiora ad fallendum, quã humanus animus aſſequi poſſit. Ipſe ſic adoritur, ut apprehendat aliquam, & ſolidam veritatem, quæ negari non poteſt, atque eam adeò callidè & aſturè urget & acuit, adeò ſpecioſe fucat ſuum mendacium, ut fallat vel cautiſſimos. Uti cogitatio illa, quæ Judæ cor percuſſit, vera erat, *Tradidi ſanguinem juſtum*: hoc Judas negare non poterat. Sed hoc erat mendacium, *Ergo eſt deſperandum de gratia Dei.* Et tamen diabolus hoc mendacium, hanc cogitationem tam violenter urſit, ut Judas eam vincere non poſſet, ſed deſperaret. Proinde, bone frater, domine Papiſta, non mentitur Satan, quando accuſat, aut urget magnitudinem peccati, &c. Sed

This

ibi mentitur Satan, quando ultrà urget, ut desperem de gratia, &c. Confessus quidem sum (lege Dei convictus) coram diabolo, me peccasse, me damnatum esse, ut Judam. Sed verto me ad Christum cum Petro, &c. *Luth. loc. citat. fol.* 230.

This plainly shewes, what (in *Luthers* judgment) the Devill did aime at, though he failed in his designe. Neither is this answer impertinent, as Mr. *Breerley* also doth pretend, as may sufficiently appear by what I have said before. It makes nothing (he saith) to prove that the Devill therefore did not instruct *Luther* against the Masse. But what if *Luther* were convinced of his errour by those arguments, which the Devill urged against him, only to drive him to despaire? This doth but set forth the wisdom and goodnesse of God, in making use of the malice of the Devill for the good of those whom he loveth. As *Austine* observeth in the reformation, which God wrought in his Mother, when she was a young girle, by the means of a maid that falling out with her, cast her in the teeth with her wine-bibbing, thinking only to reproach and vex her; but God by the distemper of the one did work a cure upon the other.

Breerl. Apol. pag. 741.

Quid tunc egisti Deus meus? Unde curasti? Unde sanasti? Nonne protulisti durum & acutum ex alterâ animâ convitium, tanquam medicinale ferrum, ex occultis provisionibus tuis, & uno ictu putredinem illam præcidisti? Illa enim irata, exagitare appetivit minorem dominam, non sanare, &c. At tu Domine rector cœlitum & terrenorum, ad usus tuos contorquens profunda torrentis, fluxum seculorum ordinans turbulentum, etiam de alterius animæ in sanie sanasti alteram. *Aug. Confess. lib. 9. cap. 8.*

Pag. 88. From *Luther* the Marques passeth to *Zuinglius*, saying, that "*Gualterus* calls him the author of warre, the disturber of "peace, proud and cruell: and instances in his strange at- "tempts against the *Tigurines* his fellowes, whom he forced "by want and famine to follow his Doctrine, and that he "died in armour, and in the warre.

Answ. Zuinglius *vindicated.* When I only looked upon the place, as cited by the Marques, *viz.* *In Apolog. pro Zuing.* I could not but admire, that *Gualterus* in his Apologie for *Zuinglius* should write thus of him: But examining the truth of the Quotation, I am much more filled with admiration. For *Gaulterus* is made to charge *Zuinglius* with these things, which he doth purposely and professedly clear him of, com-

Hic ergò nonnullorum infirmitate abusa adversariorum improbitas, *Zuinglium* iniquissimum belli authorem, & violentum pacis publicæ turbatorem

complaining of those that do charge him with them. He shews that *Zuinglius* was not the author of that war, which was betwixt the *Tigurines* and their neighbours. It was the fashion (he saith) among the *Tigurines*, when they went to war in behalf of their country, to have their Ministers along with them. And so *Zuinglius* went out to battel, and died in it, and that armed; yet not either as chief Commander, or Ensigne-bearer, but only as a good Citizen, and faithful Pastor, who might not leave his people in such an exigence. And whereas the Marquess speaks of *Gualterus* his instancing in *Zuinglius* his strange attempts against the *Tigurines*, &c. it was a great oversight in him: For *Gualterus* only taxeth them, who say, *Zuinglius Tigurinis novi & exquisiti facinoris contra socios audendi author fuerit, vt videl. victus inopiâ & famis necessitate eos in suas partes concedere cogeret*, &c. that is, *That* Zuinglius *caused the* Tigurines *to attempt a strange enterprise against their companions, (other* Helvetians *that were their confederates) so as by want and famine to force them to joyn with them*, &c. Thus all this great charge brought against *Zuinglius*, is built meerly upon mistakes.

fingit, &c. Duo itaque hîc nobis agenda veniunt: primum quòd *Zuinglius* nec belli author fuerit, nec violento gladio immanis & barbari militis instar, in aciem & pugnam eruperit: alterum, quòd non ideo vel miser, vel mendax, & blasphemus dici possit, quòd eo mortis genere sublatus sit. —— Licet his & communem patriæ morem addere, quæ non abs re militiis pro patria susceptis, verbi & rerum sacrarum ministros adhibere solet. —— Pugnæ non ut belli imperator, vel antesignanus, sed ut Pastor pro more gentis, & civis fidelis, *Zuinglius* interfuit. —— Obiit certè in bello *Zuinglius*, & armatus obiit: sed bonus civis, & fidelis pastor suis periclitantibus deesse, nec gregem suum pereuntem deserere potuit. *Gualt. Apol. pro Zuingl.*

The next that the Marquesse falls upon, is *Beza*, upon "whom is cast a most foul aspersion, That in his *Epigrams* he "hath Verses concerning his Boy *Andebert*, and his Wench "*Candida*; and that having debated at large which sinne is "to be preferr'd, he chooseth the Boy at last. *Page* 89.

Answ. If *Beza* had indeed sometime been guilty of this vile enormity which is fained of him, what could any justly inferre from hence, but that the grace of God did eminently appeare in that change which afterwards was wrought in him? The Apostle having spoken of such as are guilty of grosse sinnes, and among the rest of this here charged upon *Beza*, saith to the Corinthians, *And such were some of you,* *Beza* vindicated.

but you are waſhed, but you are ſanctified, but you are juſtified in the name of the Lord Jeſus, and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. 6. 11. But it can never be proved that *Beza* was guilty of ſuch wickedneſſe, though divers both Romaniſts and Lutherans have charged him with it. *Beza* hath made anſwer for himſelf. 1. He confeſſeth that in his younger years he had exerciſed his Poetical faculty by compoſing amatorious Verſes: but, he ſaith, it is no equal dealing, that what he did in ſport, ſhould be interpreted as done in earneſt. 2. He profeſſeth, that he had by a publike writing rejected and diſavowed thoſe Verſes; and complaineth of his adverſaries, who would not ſuffer them to be aboliſhed. 3. He ſheweth that this *Candida* ſpoken of in his Epigrams, is but a fained name. 4. That *Andebert*, who is alſo mentioned in thoſe Epigrams, was a man of known integrity, and of great dignity in *France*; and that therefore an odious thing it was, ſo to pervert that great friendſhip and familiarity which he had with him, as to turn it into that execrable filthineſſe not to be named. Mr. *Breerley*, who ſets down a great many of thoſe Verſes, which the Marqueſſe doth but point at, takes upon him to refell that which ſome others anſwer in the behalf of *Beza*, but never takes notice of this which *Beza* hath ſaid in his own behalf.

Poeticos meos luſus, quum ut res ſeriò dictas & ſcriptas interpretaris, quis te judex æquus audiat? *Beza Apol. 2. ad Claud. de Sainctes.*

Cur publico ſcripto à me abdicatos fœtus aboleri non finis? *Beza ibid.*

Et quænam illa eſt Candida? Uxor mea ſcilicet, quam in meis verſiculis prægnantem ſuperis commendo, quum uxor mea nunquam etiam peperierit. *Beza ibid.*

Quid, quum uſque eò proveheris, ut meam cum honeſtiſſimo viro, & jam tum in Senatu Pariſienſi advocato, quem vocant, nunc verò in civitate Aurelienſi magnâ cum dignitate verſanti, amicitiam & familiaritatem ſummam ad neſarium & execrandum illud ſcelus tranſferas, &c. quis teipſum vir honeſtus non execretur? *Beza ibid.*

Breerl. Apol. pag. 583, &c.

Page 90. But the Marqueſſe returns to *Luther*; and beſides other things which he objects againſt him, but proves only by the teſtimony of his adverſaries, or by ſuch pieces of *Luthers* own Works as I have not liberty to peruſe, he taxeth him for giving ſuch opprobrious termes to King *Henry* 8.

Of *Luther's* writing againſt K. *Hen.* 8. *Anſ.* It is true, K. *Hen.* 8. having written (or at leaſt ſome other in his name) againſt *Luther* and his Doctrine, *Luther* did return anſwer ſo as to ſhew but ſmall reſpect to the perſon

perſon againſt whom he wrote. But afterwards *Luther*, in an Epiſtle which he wrote to the King, confeſſed his fault, humbly craving pardon, and offering to write a publike recantation, and to do the King honour, if he ſhould require it. Indeed the King not anſwering *Luthers* expectation, but inſtead of accepting his ſubmiſſion ſetting forth another book againſt him, with his Epiſtle annexed to it, and inſulting over him as if he had recanted his doctrine, *Luther* made anſwer to this book alſo, yet ſo as to abſtain from thoſe terms of contumely and reproach which before he had uſed, only ſhewing that he was firm and ſtedfaſt in his doctrine, yea daily more and more confirmed in it; and that no mans perſon, how great ſoever he were, ſhould be of any eſteem with him ſo as to bring him to any recantation in that reſpect.

Mihi conſcius maximè ſum graviſſimè eſſe tuam Majeſt. libello meo, quem non ingenio meo, ſed incitantibus his qui Majeſt. tuæ parùm favebant, ſtultus & præceps edidi——. Quare his literis proſterno me pedibus Majeſt. tuæ quàm poſſum humillimè, & per Chriſti amorem, crucem & gloriam oro & obſecro, Majeſt. tua dignetur ſeſe ſubmittere, & veniam donare in quibuſcunque Majeſt. tuam læſi, &c. Deinde ſi Majeſt. tuæ ſereniſſ. non videbitur contemnendum, ut alio libello publico palinodiam cantem, & nomen Majeſt. tuæ rurſus honorem, det mihi clementem aliquam ſignificationem, tum in me mora non erit ulla, faciam illud libentiſſimè. *Luth. epiſt. ad Reg. Angl. tom. 2.*

Superbè ad iſtud Regis ſcriptum eram taciturus, niſi me mea Epiſtola moveret, quam quicunque eſt libelli author, ita interpretatur, quaſi palinodiam cecinerim, h. e. meam doctrinam retractaverim, ut omnino reſpondendum eſſe putem. —— Si quis vel regum vel principum arbitratur Lutherum ſeſe ita ſubmiſſurum ipſis, ut quaſi parùm rectè piéque docuerit, petiturus ſit veniam ſupplex: nemo omnium mortalium (quod ad doctrinam noſtram attinet) unquàm à me tanti fiet, ut eum ſim vel flocci penſurus, tantum abeſt ut quiſquam me palinodiam cantaturum ſperare debeat. —— Abſit nobis in cauſa religionis ſubmiſſio: abſit omnis patefactæ veritatis revocatio. —— Si quis fortè libellum Regis contra me ſcriptum legens, dubitet de me meâque conſtantiâ, & voluntate, quaſi quæ antea ſcripſerim & docuerim, eâ Epiſtolâ, quam Regi ſcripſi privatim, recantaverim; is hoc ſibi perſuadeat, adeò me non recantaſſe, nec recantaturum unquam, ut apertè ſententiam me indies incredibiliter magis magiſque divinâ gratiâ corroborari, tam procul abeſt ut apicem vel iota ſim revocaturus. *Luth. ad maledic. & contumel. Script. Reg. Angl. lit. tom. 2.*

The Marqueſſe having cenſured ſome of the prime Doctors of the Reformed Churches, falls to cenſure the people, as being generally averſe from all honeſty and godlines; and to this end he alleadgeth the words of *Luther*, and ſome others, who complain of the vitious and corrupt wayes of thoſe that live under the pure preaching of the Goſpel; and he concludes, *How could the people be better, when their Miniſters were ſo bad?* *Page 93.*

Bellarmine urging alſo ſome of theſe teſtimonies, proceeds ſo farre in his cenſure, as to ſay, that though among them of the Church of *Rome* (for that he means by the *Catholike Church*) there be many bad, yet among Proteſtants (whom after his manner he terms *Hereticks*) there is none good; and this (he ſaith) is notorious.

Quod verò attinet ad populum, ſunt quidem in Eccleſiâ Catholicâ plurimi mali, ſed ex hæreticis nullus eſt bonus; & quanquam res ipſa notiſſima eſt, &c. *Bell. de Not. Eccleſ. l. 4. c. 13.*

Of the people profeſſing the Proteſtant Religion.

But if both Miniſters and people were bad, as their adverſaries pretend, yet might their doctrine and profeſſion be good for all that. It was the Apoſtles complaint in his time, *All ſeek their own, not the things that are Jeſus Chriſts*, Phil. 2. 21. Yet the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, which they preached and profeſſed, was never a whit the worſe for all this, though with ſome it might be worſe accounted of. In like manner the Prophets frequently complain of the people of the Jews, whoſe Religion nevertheleſſe was the only true Religion in the world. See *Iſa.* 1. 4, 5, 6. *Jer.* 5. 1. 2. & 9. 2. &c. *Ezek.* 22. 2. &c. and ſo many other places. And that the Proteſtant doctrine is not to blame, what ever the Preachers and profeſſors of it be, may appear by thoſe very teſtimonies which the Marqueſſe and other alledge. For in that (as they ſhew) Miniſters tax and reprove people for being ſo bad, it argues that the doctrine delivered unto them, is good, though they make no good uſe of it. But that Proteſtants are ſo univerſally bad, as that *Bellarmine* ſhould ſay there is none good among them, is too groſſe an aſperſion; and wondrous impudence it is to adde, that this is notorious to all that know them. I will only cite the teſtimony of *Bodinus* one that never withdrew himſelf (for any thing I finde) from communion with the Church of *Rome*: He ſpeaking of *Geneva*, where *Calvin* and *Beza* were Miniſters of the Goſpel, exceedingly commends the diſcipline there uſed, *Then which* (he ſaith) *nothing could be imagined*

Sed illud apud Genevates laudabile, ſi quid uſquam gentium, quodque Rempub. efficit, ſi non opibus, & imperii magnitudine, certè virtutibus ac pietate florentem: illa ſcil. Pontificum cenſura, quâ nihil magis, ac divinùs cogitari potuit ad coercendas hominum cupiditates, & ea vitia quæ legibus humanis ac judiciis emendari nullo modo poſſunt. —— Igitur nulla meretricia, nullæ ebrietates, nullæ ſaltationes, nulli mendici, nulli otioſi in eâ civitate reperiuntur. *Bodin. Method. hiſtor. cap. 6. prope finem.*

imagined greater, and more divine for the reſtraining of mens luſts, and thoſe vices, which by humane Laws and Judgements could no way be reformed. Inſomuch that no whoredomes, no drunkenneſſe, no dancings, no beggars, no idle perſons are found in that City.

But to proceed, the Marqueſſe in the concluſion of all that he hath in this kinde, relates horrible things of *Calvin* in reſpect both of his life and death, alleadging that they are written by two knowne and approved Proteſtant Authors. *Page* 95.

One of theſe Authors, whoſe words the Marqueſſe alleadgeth, was indeed a Proteſtant, but a great Lutheran, to wit, *Schluſſelberg*, and a profeſſed adverſary unto *Calvin*; and I preſume ſo alſo was the other, who (the Marqueſſe ſaith) did write the life of *Calvin*, and confirme that which is ſaid by the former, to wit,* *Heremius*, though I have not heard of him before. Mr. *Breerley* (ſo far as I finde) never mentions him, though he make very frequent uſe of *Schluſſelberg*, whoſe words concerning *Calvin*, here cited by the Marqueſſe, he alleadgeth in two ſeveral places of his *Apology*. But however, *Bolſecus* is the man from whom at firſt did proceed whatſoever any have in diſgrace of *Calvin*, either for his life, or death. Now this Author lived ſome while at *Geneva* where *Calvin* was, and being oppoſed by him (it ſeems) for ſome things which he could not approve, he both became *Calvins* bitter enemy, and alſo turned back to Popery, and was a Papiſt at that very time when he wrote of *Calvin*, as is confeſſed by Mr. *Breerley*, who ſaith, that therefore he doth purpoſely forbear to urge his teſtimony; in which reſpect alſo, it may be, the Marqueſſe made no mention of this Author, becauſe he would not ſeem in this caſe to alleadge any of their own Church. But to what porpoſe is it, that they forbear to cite *Bolſecus*, when as they cite thoſe, who have nothing in this kinde but from *Bolſecus*? He was the firſt, and for ſome while the only man that did traduce *Calvin*, as concerning his life and death. And therefore *Bellarmine*, as writing before thoſe, whom Mr. *Breerley* and the Marqueſſe mention, alleadgeth only *Bolſecus* as relating

Anſw. *Calvin* vindicated.

* So the name is printed whether rightly or no I know not.

Breerl. Apol. p. 416. & 580.

Vide Beza *in vitâ* Calvin.

Breerl. Apol. p. 580.

Bell. de Not. Eccleſ. lib. 4. *cap.* 14. & 17.

things that concerne *Calvin* of this nature.

Breerl. in his Advertiſement

But if Mr. *Breerley* (and ſo other Romaniſts) could think there was juſt cauſe to except againſt the teſtimonies of *Benno*, and others concerning Pope *Hildebrand*, called *Gregory* 7. alleadging that they were his adverſaries, and took part with the Emperour againſt him, though yet *Benno* was a Cardinal, and the reſt were all Romaniſts; what candour and ingenuity is there to alleadge againſt *Calvin* the teſtimonies of thoſe who did profeſſe themſelves adverſaries unto him? Beſides, that *Bolſecus* the firſt deviſer of theſe calumnies, was one of their own party. For the things that are objected; That concerning the manner of *Calvins* death, appears moſt falſe, by what *Beza* hath written of it, who being with *Calvin* at *Geneva* when he dyed, had more cauſe to know the truth then *Bolſecus*, who was removed (I think) from *Geneva* before that time.

Beza in vitâ Calvin.

And the other particular about *Calvins* being ſtigmatized, is clearly and fully refuted by *Andreas Rivetus* in his *Jeſuita Vapulans*, where he produceth the very Records of that City, where this is ſaid to have been done, and ſheweth by the inquiſition that was there made concerning *Calvin* (it being the place where he was born) that nothing is objected againſt him, but only his falling off from the Roman Religion. And thus (I hope) both *Calvin* and others are ſufficiently vindicated, and purged from thoſe aſperſions that are caſt upon them.

Rivet. Jeſ. Vap. cap. 2.

Page 93.

Now if I had a minde to recriminate, I might eaſily (to uſe the Marqueſſe his words) *inlarge my Paper to a volume of inſtances* in their Popes & Cardinals, Monks & Friars, Prieſts and Jeſuites (not to ſpeak of their other ſort of people) of whoſe monſtrous wickedneſſe their own Authors have largely teſtified. But I like not *Camarinam hanc movere*, to ſtir this puddle; Ile onely cite one Diſtich of *Mantuan*, who was ſomewhat before *Luther*, and is commended by *Bellarmine* as a learned and godly Poet, and one that wrote much in commendation of the Saints; but ſee what he writes in commendation of *Rome*, where the *Popes Holineſſe* (as they ſtile him) hath his Palace:

Bel. de Eccleſ. Scriptor.

Vivere

Vivere qui ſanctè cupitis, diſcedite Româ:
Omnia cum liceant, non licet eſſe bonum.
That is,
Depart from Rome, *if holy you would be:*
For there may be all things but Pietie.

Mantuan. Silv. lib. 2.

Towards the end of the *Reply*, the Marqueſſe goes about to prove, That the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* is the ſame ſtill that it was at the firſt. *Page 96. &c.*

But, 1. if all the teſtimonies were truly and pertinently alleadged, yet are they not ſufficient to evince what he aſſerteth, not ſo much as one place of Scripture being produced for proof of any of thoſe points, on which he inſiſteth. And therefore though thoſe ancient Writers, which are cited, did indeed ſpeak ſo much as is pretended, yet there being no ground nor warrant for thoſe things from the Scripture, we may ſay in the words of our Saviour, *From the beginning it was not ſo.* Mat. 19. 8. 2. Moſt of the particulars which are mentioned, I have ſpoken to before, and have ſhewed, that neither Scripture nor Fathers are on their ſide, but both againſt them. 3. And for ſome few points not touched before, I ſhall briefly conſider and examine what is objected.

"The Marqueſſe ſaith, That of old the Church did offer "prayers for the dead, both publike and private, to the end "to procure for them eaſe and reſt, &c. *Page 98.*

Prayer for the dead, as they of the Church of *Rome* do now uſe it, is grounded upon Purgatory. *It is certain* (ſaith *Bellarmine*) *that the ſuffrages of the Church do not profit either the bleſſed, or the damned, but only thoſe that are in Purgatory.* Now concerning Purgatory I have ſpoken enough before, ſhewing that it hath no foundation in Scripture, and alſo that the ancient Writers do give ſufficient teſtimony againſt it. That prayer for the dead therefore which the ancient Church did uſe, was not ſuch as the Church of *Rome* now uſeth: It was not to deliver any out of Purgatory-pains, which they were ſuppoſed *Anſw.*

Certum eſt, Eccleſiæ ſuffragia non prodeſſe beatis, nec damnatis, ſed ſolùm iis qui in Purgatorio degunt. *Bel. de Purgat. lib. 2. cap. 18. in initio.*

ſuppoſed to be in, but to perfect and conſummate their happineſſe. This may appear by *Ambroſe* his praying for the Emrour *Theodoſius* after he was dead. He beleeved him to enjoy perpetuall light, and tranquillity, and to have obtained the reward of thoſe things which he had done in the body; yet he prayed for him; but how? That God would give him that perfect reſt which he hath prepared for his Saints.

Abſolutus igitur dubio certamine fruitur nunc auguſtæ memoriæ Theodoſius luce perpetuâ, tranquillitate diuturnâ, & pro iis, quæ in hoc geſſit corpore, munerationis divinæ fructibus gratulatur. *Ambroſ. de obitu Theodoſ.*

Da requiem perfectam ſervo tuo Theodoſio, requiem illam quam præparaſti ſanctis tuis. Ibid. *In* B. Ufhers *Anſwer p.*200. *it is cited,* Da requiem perfecto ſervo tuo Theodoſio. *But in my book* Edit. Baſil. 1567. *it is as I have alleadged, which reading doth ſeem much better then the other.*

Dolendum eſt, quòd nobis citò raptus ſit; conſolandum, quod ad meliora tranſierit. *Ambroſ. de obitu Valentin.*

Quod in terris ſeminaſti, hîc mete. —— In Jacob Patriarchæ tranquillitate quieſcas. *Ibid.*

Nulla inhonoratos vos mea tranſibit oratio; nulla nox non donatos aliquâ precum mearum contentione tranſcurret. Omnibus vos oblationibus frequentabo. *Ibid.*

Te quæſo ſumme Deus, ut chariſſimos juvenes maturâ reſurrectione ſuſcites & reſuſcites: & immaturum hunc vitæ iſtius curſum maturæ reſurrectione compenſes. *Ibid. in fine.*

Μνήσθητι πάντων τῶν προκεκοιμημένων ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἀναστάσεως ζωῆς αἰωνίου. *Liturg. Baſil. & Chryſoſt.* cited by B. Ufher *Anſw. p.*216.

Ambroſe alſo praied for the Emperor *Valentinan* after his death. But did he thinke him to be in Purgatory? No ſuch matter: He was perſwaded that he was removed to a better eſtate; that what he had ſown upon earth, he did then reap; and that he did reſt in the tranquillity of the Patriark *Jacob*. Yet he profeſſeth, that he would not ceaſe to pray both for him, and for his brother *Gratian*, who was departed out of this life, and (as *Ambroſe* believed) tranſlated into a better before him. How doth he then pray for them? Only thus, That God would vouchſafe to raiſe them up with a ſpeedy reſurrection. And thus the Church (as it is in ſome ancient Liturgies) uſed to pray unto God, *to remember all thoſe that were departed in the hopes of the reſurrection of life eternal.*

The Marqueſſe cites *Tertullian* and *Auſtine*; but beſides that *Tertullian* was faln into the hereſie of *Montanus*, when hee wrote that book, which is cited, as is noted by *Pamelius*, and the book it ſelfe doth make manifeſt; beſides this, I ſay, *Tertullian* ſpeaks of a womans praying for her deceaſed husband, that he might have

Enimverò & pro animâ ejus orat, & refrigerium interim adpoſtulat ei, & in prima reſurrectione conſortium. *Tertul. de Monogam. cap.*10.

have part in the first resurrection, which favours of the opinion of the *Chiliasts*, amongst whom he is reckoned by *Hierome* in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, where he speaks of *Papias* whom he notes as the first founder of that opinion. As for *Austine*, I have shewed before that he was not resolved concerning Purgatory, and therefore neither can any thing be concluded from about praying for the dead in that kind as they of the Roman Church do practise it.

"After prayer for the dead, the Marquesse speaks of the "fast of Lent, which he saith the Church anciently held "for a custome, not free, but necessary, and of Apostolical "tradition, and so to fast all the Fridayes in the year in "memory of Christs death, except Christmas-day fell on a "Friday. *Page 99.*

It is true, *Hierome* (as is alleadged) speaks of a Fast of forty dayes, which they used to observe, and that according to the tradition of the Apostles. But this tradition was very uncertain, it seems, and the observation of the Fast very various. For *Socrates* an ancient Ecclesiastical historian records, that somewhere they fasted three weeks before Easter, somewhere six weeks; and that in some places they began their Fast seven weeks before Easter, but did fast only fifteen dayes, not altogether, but now one day, now another. And yet (which he saith he wondred at) all did call their Fast *Quadragesimam*, A forty dayes Fast: He sayes also moreover, that they did not only thus differ in the number of dayes, in which they fasted, but also in the manner of their fasting. For some (as he relates) did eat both fish and foul: Some did abstain from egges, and all fruit that is inclosed in a hard shell: Some did eat nothing but dry bread: Some not so much as that neither: Some having fasted until the ninth houre (three a clock in the afternoon) did then use divers kindes of meats. And he addes, that *seeing there is nothing in Scripture commanded concerning this matter, it is manifest that the Apostles left it free to every one to do herein as he should think meet.* And the like also for the different

Answ. *Hieron. ad Marcel. Epist. 54.*

Socrat. lib. 6. cap. 21.

Ac quoniam nemo de eâ præceptum literarum monumentis proditum potest ostendere, perspicuum est, Apostolos liberam potestatem in eâdem cujusque ingenti & arbitrio permisisse, &c. *Socrat. ibid.*

Sozomen lib.7. cap.19. mannner of obſerving the Lent-faſt in reſpect of the time, hath *Sozomen* in his Eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, who lived in the ſame time with the other, *viz.* 440. years after Chriſt according to *Bellarmines* computation.

Bel. de ſcrip. Eccleſ.

Page 99. *The Church* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *held then mingling of water with wine in the ſacrifice of the Euchariſt, for a thing neceſſary, and of divine and Apoſtolical tradition.*

Anſw. *Cyprian* indeed in the place alleadged, *viz. Epiſt.*63. doth ſpeak of the mixture of wine and water in the Euchariſt, as a thing neceſſary to be obſerved. But 1. *Auſtine* hath taught us, That *it is no wrong to* Cyprian *to make a difference betwixt his writings and the Scriptures.* 2. *Cyprian* himſelfe, though ſpeaking of another occaſion, doth ſhew us what we are here to anſwer, *Whence* (ſaith he) *is this tradition? Did it come either from Chriſt in the Goſpel, or from the Apoſtles in their writings? For God doth require us to do thoſe things that are written, ſaying to* Joſhua, *The book of the Law ſhall not depart out of thy mouth*, &c. Joſ.1.8. *And when Chriſt ſent his Apoſtles, he bade them baptize all Nations, and teach them to obſerve whatſoever he commanded,* Mat.28.19.20. *If therefore it be commanded in the Goſpel, or contained either in the Epiſtles, or in the Acts of the Apoſtles, then let it be obſerved as a divine and holy tradition.* Now in the Epiſtle, which the Marqueſſe alleadgeth, *Cyprian* proveth againſt the *Aquarians* (ſuch as did uſe only water in the Euchariſt) that Chriſt in the inſtitution of the Sacrament uſed wine; this he proves by that which is written Mat.26.29. *I will not drinke henceforth of this fruit of the Vine*, &c. but that Chriſt alſo did uſe water, he doth not prove, neither can it be proved by the Scripture. Yet our Divines do grant, that probably Chriſt might mixe wine and water in the Sacramental cup, not for any myſtical ſignification, nor as a matter of neceſſary obſervation, but only as in thoſe hot Countries

Nos nullum Cypriano facimus injuriam, cum ejus quaſlibet literas â canonicâ divinarum Scripturarum authoritate diſtinguimus. *Aug. contra Creſcon. lib.2 cap.*31.

Unde eſt iſta traditio? utrumne de dominicâ & Evangelica authoritate deſcendens, an de Apoſtolorum mandatis atque Epiſtolis veniens? Ea enim facienda eſſe, quæ ſcripta ſunt, Deus teſtatur, & proponit ad Jeſum Nave, dicens, Non recedet liber legis, *&c.* Item Dominus Apoſtolos ſuos mittens, mandat baptizari gentes, & do eri, ut obſervent quæcunque ille præcepit. Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apoſtolorum Epiſtolis, aut Actibus continetur, *&c.* obſervetur divina hæc & ſancta traditio. *Cyprian Epiſt.*74.

tries they uſed commonly to drink wine mixed with water to abate the ſtrength of it. Neither do they therefore condemn them of the Church of *Rome* for uſing this mixture, but for uſing it ſo as to make it a ſinne not to uſe it. *Bellarmine* indeed ſaith, that it is no leſſe certain that Chriſt did mixe water with wine when he inſtituted the Sacrament, then that he did uſe any wine at all for that purpoſe. For, he ſaith, neither the Evangeliſts, nor *Paul* make any mention of wine when they ſpeak of the cup in the Euchariſt. As for the words, *I will not drinke henceforth of the fruit of the Vine*, &c. he ſaith, S. *Luke* doth plainly ſhew, they were ſpoken not of the cup in the Euchariſt, but that cup which was given after the eating of the Paſcal Lamb. But this contradicts *Cyprian* in that very Epiſtle, which is alleadged againſt us. For their citing theſe words, he infers from them as a thing clear and evident, that it was wine which Chriſt called his blood; and that the Sacrament is not rightly celebrated, if wine be wanting. Yea *Maldonate* cites many of the ancient Writers beſides *Cyprian*, who underſtand thoſe words of the cup in the Euchariſt. And whereas *Bellarmine* doth urge *Luke* 22.17,18. to prove that thoſe words, *I will not henceforth drink* &c. have reference to another cup, and not that in the Euchariſt, *Auſtine* (as himſelf confeſſeth) taketh thoſe words in *Luke* to be related by anticipation, and not in their due order, which *Matthew* and *Mark* obſerved. And though he ſay, that *Auſtine* did not diligently conſider the place, yet *Janſenius* writing profeſſedly upon it, approves *Auſtins* opinion rather then *Hieroms* who conceives two ſeveral cups to be ſpoken of in S. *Lukes* Goſpel; neither doth *Bellarmine* anſwer his argument, which he doth alleadge for it. But however, he ſhews that the words, as they are related by S. *Matthew*, and S. *Marke*, cannot be referred to

Vide Chemnit. Exam.

Bel. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 10. ſect. Cæterum.

Dico vobis, non bibam amodò, *&c.* Quâ in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuiſſe, quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuiſſe, quod ſanguinem ſuum dixit. Unde apparet, ſanguinem Chriſti non offerri, ſi deſit vinum calici, *&c. Cypr. Epiſt. 63.*

Maldon. in Mat. 26. 29.

Bellar. de Euchar. lib. 1. cap. 11. ſect. Si rurſus.

Jam quæ de calice narrantur à Lucâ, antequam acceptum panem commemoret, veriſimile omninò eſt ſecundum Auguſtini ſententiam, intelligenda eſſe de calice ſacro, quo ſcil. ſanguinis ſui participationem Dominus tradidit, ut per præoccupationem illa Lucas narraverit ante acceptum panem, *&c. Jan. Concord. c. 131. ſub init.* Verùm veriſimiliorem D. Auguſtini ſententiam, illud facit, *&c. Janſen. ibid.* Quidam Catholici aſſerunt hæc verba (*Mat. 26. 29.*

Matth. 14. 25.) non esse dicta à Domino post calicem sacrum, sed post priorem illum calicem, cujus meminit Lucas, quem volunt alium esse ab isto, &c. At istud non patitur ordo horum Evangelistarum. Cum enim nullus alterius calicis fecerint mentionem præterquam sacri, quando dicitur, ex hoc genimine, nullus alius calix intelligi potest ab eis demonstratus, quàm cujus meminerunt. *Jansen. ib. sub finem cap.*

Sic autem in sanctificando calice Domini offerri aqua sola non potest, quomodo nec vinum solum potest. Nam si vinum tantùm quis offerat, sanguis Christi incipit esse sine nobis: si verò aqua sit sola, plebs incipit esse sine Christo. Quando autem utrumque miscetur, &c. tunc sacramentum spirituale & cœleste perficitur. Sic verò calix Domini non est aqua sola, aut vinum solum, &c. *Cypr. Epist. 63.*

Falsò Chemnitius Catholicis in commune tribuit, quòd asserant aquam in Eucharistiâ esse de necessitate Sacramenti cum paucissimi id affirment. *Bel. de Euchar. lib. 4. cap. 10. sect. Porrò.*

Accusat (Chemnitius) Ecclesiam, quòd existimet non posse esse calicem Domini, nisi aqua adsit, & hanc vocat falsam opinionem necessariò taxandam. At opinio illa, quod attinet admodum loquendi, S. Cyprian. est lib. 2. epist. 3. Quod ad rem attinet, non est Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, fortasse etiam nec S. Cypriani. *Bel. ibid. cap. 11. sect. Quinto.*

any other cup then that in the Eucharist, of which they make mention immediately before, and of none other. 3. *Cyprian* in this very point about the mingling of wine and water in the Eucharist doth differ as well from them of the Church of *Rome* as from Protestants. For he makes this mixture of such necessity, as to hold it no Sacrament, if there be not in the cup both wine and water. Otherwise if there bee either onely water, or onely wine, he holds it to be none of Christs Cup, none of his Sacrament. But *Bellarmine* taxeth *Chemnitius* for charging them of the Roman Church with this opinion, and saith, that very few of them do hold it. Why then do they presse us with the testimony of *Cyprian*, they themselves dissenting from him as well as we? For it is over vain and frivolous, that *Bellarmine* saith, that though *Cyprian* spake in that manner, yet perhaps he meant otherwise.

Page 99. "But to proceed, The Marquesse saith that anciently the "Church held exorcismes, exsufflations, and renuntiations, "which are made in Baptisme, for sacred ceremonies, and "of Apostolical tradition. And a little after, *The Church in the ceremonies of Baptisme used then oyle, salt, wax-light, exorcismes, the sign of the Crosse, the word Ephata, and other things that accompany it*, &c.

Answ. But 1. What authority is there from Gods word for all, or any of these Ceremonies? Let them be proved by the Scriptures

Scriptures, and then we will acknowledge them for divine and holy traditions; but otherwiſe we have no reaſon to do it. And for this we have *Cyprian* (to whom other ancient Writers might be added, if need were) to ſpeak for us, as I have ſhewed a little before, though here among others he alſo be alleadged againſt us. 2. *Bellarmine* ſpeaking of rites and ceremonies ſaith, *That they muſt not ſo be multiplied, as with their multitude to overwhelm Religion, to which they ought to be ſubſervient.* And for this he cites *Auſtine.* But ſurely the ceremonies of Baptiſme, which the Marqueſſe here partly expreſſeth, and partly intimateth (*Bellarmine* doth reckon up particularly no fewer then two and twenty) are ſo many, as that they muſt needs overwhelme Baptiſme.

Ritus non ſunt nimis multiplicandi, ita ut ſuâ multitudine obruant quodammodo religionem, cui ſervire debent.—Ita docet Auguſtinus, *Epiſt.119.c.19. Bell.de effect.Sacram.l.2.c.30.ſect.His addunt.*

Bel.de Bapt. lib.1.cap.25. & 26. & 27.

3. Some rites and ceremonies anciently uſed in Baptiſme, are now aboliſhed in the Church of *Rome.* Anciently they uſed to dip the perſon baptized thrice in the water, which now *Bellarmine* ſaith is not ſo, but in ſome places they dip once, and in ſome place thrice; neither being of the eſſence of the Sacrament. But elſewhere he tels us, that the Church hath determined in the fourth Councel of *Toledo*, that there ſhall be but one dipping uſed in Baptiſme. So alſo *Bellarmine* amongſt the ceremonies of Baptiſme anciently uſed, mentioneth the taſting of milk and hony, or wine, which ceremony yet, he ſaith, now is not in uſe. Thus their Apoſtolical traditions, as they call them, they themſelves can reject when they pleaſe.

Nunc pro regionum varietate vel una, vel trina merſio adhibetur neutrum enim eſt de eſſentiâ Sacramenti. *Bell. de Bap.lib.1.cap.26.ſect.Quarta.* Eccleſia ſtatuit, ut unâ tantùm merſione daretur baptiſmus, ut patet ex Concil. 4.Tolet.cap.5. *Bell.de Euchar.lib. 4.cap.28.ſect.Ac primum.*

Quinta ceremonia olim fuit delibatio lactis & mellis, ſeu vini; quæ tamen hoc tempore non eſt in uſu. *Bellar.de Bapt.lib.1.cap.27.*

The Church held then (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *Baptiſme for Infants of abſolute neceſſity; and for this cauſe then permitted Lay-men to baptiſe in danger of death.* Page 99.

The abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſme is not here ſimply urged, but only in reſpect of infants. The Marqueſſe, it ſeems, *Anſw.*

considered, that there are expresse testimonies of Antiquity for the salvation of some of years that die unbaptized. 2. And why is there not the same hope for infants? Why must Baptism be more absolutely necessary for them then for others? The Romanists themselves distinguish of baptisme, and tell us of the baptisme of water, of the Spirit, and of blood or martyrdome; and hold either of the two last to be available unto salvation without the first. Is not God able to baptize Infants with his Spirit, though they want the baptisme of water? And where hath he said, that he will not do it? *It is without doubt* (saith *Bellarmine*) *that true conversion doth supply the want of the baptism of water, when any not through contempt, but through necessity die without it.* Now it is without doubt, that God can, if he please, work spiritual regeneration in Infants that are not baptized with water; and that if they die without that baptisme, it is on their part meerly of necessity, and not of contempt. And if children dying unbaptized, do necessarily perish for want of baptisme, then Christian parents must sorrow for the death of such children, as they that have no hope; whereas the Apostle forbids Christians to sorrow for the dead in that manner, 1 *Thess.*4.13. *Bellarmine* also confesseth, that divers great & eminent writers of the Church of *Rome*, as *Cajetan*, *Gabriel*, and others have thought it not agreeable to the mercy of God, that innumerable infants should perish without any fault of theirs, meerly for want of that outward baptisme, which it was not in their power to have. And *Cassander* testifieth that in his time many very learned men did hold, that though children died without baptism, yet the desire of the Church, and especially of their parents to procure them baptisme, if it could have been, is accepted of

Sed audio vos dolere, quòd non acceperit sacramenta baptismatis.——Non habet ergo gratiam, quam desideravit? *Ambros. de obitu Valentin. Vide ibidem plura. Vide etiam Bernard. Epist. 77. & Aug. de bapt. contra Donatist. l. 4. c. 22.*

Baptismus fluminis, flaminis, & sanguinis. Bell. de bapt. *lib. 1. cap. 6.*

At sine dubio credendum est, veram conversionem supplere baptismum aquæ, cum non ex contemptu, sed ex necessitate sine baptismo aquæ aliqui decedunt. *Bellar. loc. citat.*

Si baptismus est necessarius, peribunt sine suâ culpâ infiniti infantes; quòd alienum videtur à Dei misericordia. Hoc argumentum Petri Martyris fuit etiam quorundam Catholicorum, ut Cajetani, Gabrielis, & aliorum, &c. *Bellar. de Baptis. lib. 1. cap. 4. sect. 5.*

Cassand. Consult. artic. 9.

of God, and available to those children, as if they had been baptized. 3. The Ancients were as much for the necessity of Infants receiving the Eucharist, as for the necessity of their being baptized. *Austine* (as *Maldonate* relates) in many places makes the Eucharist so necessary, as to deny that Infants can be saved without it. For which opinion also the same *Jesuite* cites Pope *Innocentius*, and saith, that for 600. yeares it did prevail in the Church. Yet the Romanists have taken leave to depart from the Ancients in this, therefore in reason they may give us leave to depart from them in the other, except the authority of Scripture can be proved to be against us. 4. Concerning the estate of Infants dying unbaptized, the Romanists themselves generally recede from the opinion of *Austine*, whom here the Marquesse doth alledge against us. For he saith, that there is no middle place for Infants; but that either they must inherit the kingdome of Heaven, or else must endure everlasting fire: and this latter he makes to belong unto all that die without baptisme. But they of the Church of *Rome* are of another mind: For they make the damned to be in one region of Hell, where they are in torment; and Infants that die unbaptized, in another region of Hell, where they suffer no pain, but only the losse of Heaven, and that happinesse which the Saints enjoy. They have no reason therefore to urge us with *Austin*, when as themselves do not accord with him.

Augustinus sexcentis locis docet adeò esse omnibus Eucharistiam ad salutem necessariam, ut ne infantes quidem nisi eâ sumptâ salvi esse possint. *Mald. ad Joh. 6. 28.*

Missam facio Augustini & Innocentii sententiam, quæ 600 circiter annos viguit in Ecclesiâ, Eucharistiam etiam infantibus esse necessariam. *Idem ibid. ad v. 53.*

Venturus est Dominus, &c. duas partes facturus est, dextram & sinistram. Sinistris dicturus, Ite in ignem æternum, &c. Dextris dicturus, Venite benedicti, &c. Nullus relictus est medius locus, ubi ponere queas infantes. —— Qui non in dextrâ; proculdubio in sinistrâ. Ergo qui non in regno, proculdubio in ignem æternum. *Aug. de verb. apost. serm. 14.*

Constituunt Scholastici communi consensu intra terram quatuor sinus, sive unum in quatuor partes divisum; unum pro damnatis, alterum pro purgandis, tertium pro infantibus sine baptismo abeuntibus; quartum pro justis, qui moriebantur ante Christi passionem. —— Pro pœnâ solius damni æternâ est limbus puerorum. *Bellar. de Purgat. lib. 2. cap. 6.*

The Church held then (saith the Marquesse) *divers Degrees in the Ecclesiastical regiment, to wit, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Sub-deacons, the Acolythe, Exorcist, Reader, and Porter.* Page 99.

Here

Answ. Here are eight several sorts of Ecclesiastical officers, which are reckoned as so many several orders. For so presently after the Marquesse addes, *And in the Episcopal order acknowledged divers seats of jurisdiction of positive right*, &c. Thus he makes Episcopacie, and so the rest, each of them a distinct order, and that (as it seems) of divine right.

But 1. for Episcopacie, the School-men hold it to be no distinct order. *Lombard*, the Master of them, reckons but seven distinct orders; to wit, all these here mentioned except Bishops, and sayes that anciently Bishops and Presbyters were the same. So also *Bonaventure*, whom the Church of *Rome* hath canonized for a Saint, and stiles the *Seraphical* Doctor, he also (I say) professedly disputing the question, whether Episcopacie be an order, concludes that it is not, but only a dignity, and that a Bishop is in that respect of like nature with an Archpresbyter (or Dean) an Archbishop, a Patriarch, and a Pope. And he cites also *Hugo de S. Victore*, who was somewhat more ancient then *Lombard*, as being of this opinion. *Cassander* saith, that the Divines and Canonists do not agree in this, whether Episcopacie be to be reckoned amongst orders. But all (he saith) agree in this, that in the Apostles time there was no difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters, but that afterward for the keeping of order, and the avoiding of Schisme, a Bishop was set over the Presbyters, and the power of ordaining was reserved unto him only. *Hierome* is plaine to this purpose, to wit, that at first Bishops and Presbyters were the same, and he proves it by *Phil.* 1. 1. *Act.* 20. 28. *Tit.* 1. 5, 6, 7.

Lombard. lib. 4 dist. 24.

Apud vetres idem Episcopi & Presbyteri fuerunt. *Lomb. ibid.*

Intra hunc gradum & ordinem contingit esse distinctionem dignitatum & officiorum, quæ tamen novum gradum vel ordinem non constituunt, ut Archipresbyter, Episcopus, Archiepiscopus, Patriarcha, Pontifex summus. — Hanc ergo opinionem sustinendo dicamus, quod Episcopatus præcisè loquendo non est ordo, &c. *Bonavent. in Sent. lib. 4. dist. 24. art. 2. quæst. 3.*

An Episcopatus inter ordines ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit. Convenit autem inter omnes, olim Apostolorum ætate, inter Episcopos & Presbyteros, discrimen nullum fuisse, sed postmodum ordinis servandi, & Schismatis evitandi causâ, Episcopum Presbyteris fuisse præpositum, cui soli Chirotonia, id est, ordinandi potestas servata sit. *Cassand Consult. artic. 14.*

Apud veteres iidem Episcopi & Presbyteri fuerunt. *Hieron. Epist. ad Ocean. Vide Hieron. Epist. ad Evagr.*

2. For the last five orders, to wit, Subdeacons, Acolythe, Exorcist,

Exorciſt, Reader, and Porter, they have no foundation at all in Scripture; we finde there no mention of them. And *Lombard* confeſſeth, that the office of Deacons and of Presbyters, are by way of excellency called holy orders; for that the primitive Church had onely thoſe two, and the Apoſtle gave precept concerning them onely. So alſo *Caſſander* ſaith, it is manifeſt, that Deacons and Presbyters are properly called holy orders; for that the primitive Church had thoſe onely. And this he ſaith is teſtified by Pope *Urban*, and noted by *Chryſoſtome* and *Ambroſe*. And as for the five leſſer, and inferior orders, he ſaith, that now in the Church of *Rome* they are altogether confuſed, and almoſt aboliſhed.

Cum omnes ſint ſpirituales, & ſacri, excellenter tamen Canones duos tantùm ſacros ordines appellari cenſent, Diaconatus ſcil. & Presbyteratus, quia hos ſolos primitiva Eccleſia legitur habuiſſe, & de his ſolis præceptum Apoſtoli habemus. *Lomb. lib. 4. diſt. 24.*

Conſtat etiam ſacros ordines proprie Diaconatum, & Presbyteratum, ut quos ſolos primitivam Eccleſiam in uſu habuiſſe legatur, id quod teſtatur Urbanus Papa, & annotavit Chryſoſt. & Ambroſ. in 1 Tim. ex. eo quod Epiſcopi ordinationi ſtatim Diaconi ordinationem ſubjiciat. Ad minores verò ordines quod attinet, qui olim quinque ſe ordine conſequentes memorari conſuerunt; hi ſanè præſente tempeſtate, neglectâ omni diſciplinâ, & politiâ Eccleſiaſticâ prorſus confuſi ſunt, & eorum officia propemodum ceſſarunt, *&c. Caſſand. Conſult. artic. 14.*

"The Marqueſſe ſaith, that anciently the Church had one "Supereminent (by Divine Law) which was the Pope, "without whom nothing could be decided, appertaining "to the univerſal Church, and the want of whoſe pre- "ſence, either by himſelf, or his Legats, or his confirma- "tion, made all Councels (pretended to be univerſal) un- "lawful. *Page* 108.

1. The name of Pope anciently was common to all Biſhops. *Hierome* calls *Alipius* an African Biſhop, Pope *Alipius*. So alſo he ſtiles *Auſtine* in divers Epiſtles, which he wrote unto him. 2. That the Biſhop of *Rome*, to whom the name of Pope in after times came to be appropriated, is *Supereminent by divine Law*, was no part of the Ancients Creed. Indeed of old the Biſhops of *Rome*, by reaſon of the wealth and glory of the City, did live in a very pompous and ſtately faſhion, ſo as in their feaſts to exceed *Anſw.*

Sanctum & venerabilem fratrem noſtrum Papam Alipium, ut meo obſequio ſalutes obſecro. *Hieron ad Aug. Epiſt. 98.* Memento mei, ſancte et venerabilis Papa. *Hier. Epiſt. 91. ad Aug.* Beatiſſime Papa, *Epiſt. 94. ad Aug.* Damaſus & Urſicinus, ſupra humanum modum ad rapiendam Epiſcopalem ſedem ardentes, ſciſſis ſtudiis aſperrimè conflictabantur, aduſque mortis vulnerúmque diſcrimina adjumentis utriuſque progreſſis. -- Conſtatque in Baſilica Sicinini, ubi ritus Chriſtiani eſt

conventiculum, uno die centum triginta septem reperta cadavera peremptorum, &c. Neque ego abnuo, ostentationem rerum considerans urbanarum, hujus rei capidos, ob impetrandum quod appetunt, omni contentione laterum jurgari debere; quum id adepti, futuri sint ita seeuri, ut diteutur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insidentes circumspectè vestiti, epulas curantes profusas, adeò ut eorum convivia regales superent mensas. Qui esse poterant beati reverà, si magnitudine urbis despecta, quam vitiis opponunt, ad imitationem antistitum quorundam provincialium viverent, quos tenuitas edendi potandique parcissimè, vilitas etiam indumentorum, & supercilia humum spectantia perpetuo nutrini, verisque ejus cultoribus ut puros commendant, & verecundos. *Am. Marcel. lib.* 27.

Kings: And thereupon there was great striving for the place: when *Damasus* (whom the Marquesse here points at as so highly honoured by *Hierome*) came to be Pope, there was such a conflict betwixt him and *Ursicinus* about it, that in one day there were found in a Church 137. dead bodies of those that were slaine in the conflict. This is related by *Ammianus Marcellinus*, who lived in the same time when this happened. And though he were no Christian, yet that he did not write thus out of any ill affection towards Christians, and a desire to disgrace them, may appear, as by that ingenuity and impartiality which he elsewhere usually shews in his history, so by this, that in this very place he much commends other Bishops of meaner places, and saith, that the Bps. of *Rome* might have been happy indeed, if they would have imitated them, and despising the greatnesse of the City, would have lived sparingly, and carried themselves humbly as other Bishops of the Roman Provinces did. But so also for the same reason; to wit, the honour and dignity of *Rome*, the Bishop thereof had some priviledge and preheminencie above others. And so the first Councel of *Constantinople* decreed, that the Bishop of *Constantinople* should have the second place, to wit, next after the Bishop of *Rome*, because it was new *Rome*. And afterwards the Councel of *Chalcedon* (which was the fourth general Councel, as that of *Constantinople* was the second) for the very same reason confirmed the same, plainly expressing thus much, that because *Rome* had been the seat of the Empire, therefore the Fa-

Τὸν μὲν τοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ρώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ρώμην. *Concil. Constantinopol.* 1. *can.* 3.

Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης. διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην. οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα. καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ἁγιώτατοι ἑκατὸν πεντήκοντα θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ρώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ εὐλόγως κρίναντες τὴν Βασιλεία καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖ-

thers had given the chief honour to the Biſhop of that City, and that now *Conſtantinople* being advanced to that honour (*Conſtantine* having removed his ſeat thither) it was meet that the Biſhop of that place ſhould likewiſe be advanced, ſo as to be next to the Roman Biſhop. Thus it plainly appears, even by this very Councel, which the Marqueſſe alleadgeth, that the dignity of the Biſhop of *Rome* is built meerly upon humane authority, and earthly conſideration. Neither doth *Hierom* attribute ſuch ſupereminencie as is pretended, to *Damaſus* the Roman Biſhop: but being in the Eaſtern parts, which were much infected with *Arianiſme*, and knowing that *Damaſus* was free from that infection, he conſulted him about a point, wherein he feared leſt ſome *Arians* in the Eaſt might enſnare him. But that *Hierome* did not hold the Biſhop of *Rome* to be ſupereminent by divine Law, is clear and evident by what he wrote to *Evagrius*, namely this, *Whereſoever a Biſhop is, whether at Rome, or at Eugubium, whether at Conſtantinople, or at Rhegium, whether at Alexandria, or at Tanis, he hath the ſame merit, and the ſame Prieſthood. The power of riches, and the meanneſſe of poverty, doth not make a Biſhop either higher, or lower: but they are all the ſucceſſours of the Apoſtles.*

σαν πολιν, ϗ ὅλ' ἴσην ἀπολαυσειεν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ Βασιλίδι Ρώμη, ϗ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνη μεγαλωνδζ πράγμασι, δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσαν. Concil. Chalced. can. 28.

Nunc in occidente ſol juſtitiæ oritur; in oriente autem Lucifer ille, qui ceciderat, ſupra ſidera poſuit thronum ſuum. *Hieron. ad Damaſ. Epiſt. 57.*

Ubicunque fuerit Epiſcopus, ſive Romæ, ſive Eugubii, ſive Conſtantinopoli, ſive Rhegii, ſive Alexandriæ, ſive Tanis, ejuſdem meriti, ejuſdem eſt & ſacerdotii. Potentia divitiarum, & paupertatis humilitas, vel ſublimiorem, vel inferiorem Epiſcopum non facit. Cetenùm omnes Apoſtolorum ſucceſſores ſunt. *Hieron. ad Evagr. Epiſt. 85.*

The Marqueſſe goes on, ſaying, *In the Church then the Service was ſaid throughout the Eaſt in Greek, and throughout the Weſt, as well in Africa, as in Europe, in Latine; although that in none of the Provinces (except in Italy, and the Cities where the Roman Colonies reſided) the Latine tongue was underſtood by the common people.* Page 100.

That divine Service ſhould be performed in a tongue, which the people underſtand not, is moſt repugnant both to reaſon and Scripture. The Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 14. plainly and *Anſw.*

fully declares against it, and shews the absurdity of it. *For he that speaketh in an unknown tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man understandeth him*, v.2. *Now brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues* (viz. unknown tongues) *what shall I profit you?* v.6. *And even things without life giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?* v.7. *For if the Trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battell?* v.8. *So likewise you, except ye utter by the tongue words easie to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the aire.* v.9. *Therefore if I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be unto him that speaketh a Barbarian, and he that speaketh, shall be a Barbarian unto me*, v.11. *Else when thou shalt blesse in the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?* v.16. *In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, then ten thousand words in an unknown tongue*, v.19. The case here is so clear, that Cardinal *Cajetan* in his Commentary upon the place, is forced to confesse, That *by this doctrine of the Apostle, it is better for the edification of the people, that publick prayers be made in a tongue, which both the Clergy and the people understand, then that they be in Latine.* And hereupon also he expresseth his dislike of the use of Organs, and of chanting in Divine Service, and saith, that it were better such musical melody were laid aside, and that Divine Service were so performed, as that people might understand it. *Austine* indeed shews, that in his time and Country the Latine tongue was used in Divine Service; but withall he shews, that the people did understand it, though they were not very Grammatical and exact in it. And

Ex hâc Pauli doctrinâ habetur, quod melius ad ædificationem Ecclesiæ est orationes publicas, quæ audiente populo dicuntur, dici linguâ communi Clericis & populo, quam dici Latinè. *Cajetan. in* 1 *Cor.* 14.

Unde discere debemus eligibilius esse, ut in Ecclesiâ dicantur divina (horæ scil. canonicæ, & missæ) intelligibiliter sine melodiâ Musica, quàm sic ut non intelligi possint, qualiter sunt tam particulæ quæ sonis committuntur, quàm quas cantus reddit imperceptibiles, *&c. Cajet. ibid.*

Illud etiam, quod jam auferre non possumus de ore cantantium populorum, super ipsum floriet sanctificatio mea, nihil profectò sententiæ detrahit; auditor tamen peritior mallet hoc corrigi, ut non floriet, sed florebit diceretur. *Aug. de doct. Christ. lib.* 2. *cap.* 13.

And therefore ſometimes barbarous words were permitted, becauſe the people were acquainted with them, and underſtood them better then pure Latine words. For this reaſon he ſaith in that place, which the Marqueſſe citeth, that *floriet* was uſed for *florebit*, that is, ſhall flouriſh. And ſo elſewhere he ſaith, that he would rather uſe the word *oſſum* for a bone, then *os*, chuſing rather to be reproved by Grammarians then that the people ſhould not underſtand him. And that the Latine tongue was then generally underſtood by the people where he lived, is moſt evident alſo by that which he writeth in his Confeſſions, to wit, that though he had very much ado to learn the Greek tongue, yet the Latine he learnt without difficulty, even whilſt his Nurſe and others played with him, and becauſe he heard none ſpeak any other Language.

Habeo in abſcondito quoddam oſſum. Sic enim potius loquamur. Melius eſt, ut reprehendant nos Grammatici, quàm non intelligant populi. *Aug. in Pſal.* 138.

Nam & Latina aliquando (infans utique) nulla noveram; & tamen advertendo didici ſine ullo metu atque cruciatu, inter etiam blandimenta nutricum, & joca arridentium, & lætitias alludentium. Didici vero illa ſine ulla pœnali onere urgentium, cum me urgeret cor meum ad parienda concepta ſua: & quia non eſſet niſi aliqua verba didiciſſem, non à docentibus, ſed à loquentibus, in quorum & ego auribus parturiebam quicquid ſentiebam. *Aug. Confeſſ. lib.* 1. *cap.* 14.

The Marqueſſe, to prove ſtill, that the Church of *Rome* is not changed, but is the ſame that it was of old, mentioneth divers things which the Church then (he ſaith) obſerved, as *diſtinction of Feaſts, and ordinary dayes*, &c. *Page* 100.

Anſw.

1. Theſe are things of an inferiour alloy in compariſon of many things wherein Proteſtants charge the Church of *Rome* to be altered from what of old it was. 2. The ſame things might be obſerved of old, yet not in the ſame manner as now in the Church of *Rome* they are, *viz.* ſo as to place the worſhip of God in ſuch things. So they now do, which makes *Ferus* (though one of their own Authors) cry out, *Behold our ſtupidity and perverſeneſſe*. And again, *O prepoſterous Religion!* 3. If Proteſtants have aboliſhed ſuch things, beſides that they might lawfully do it, God in his word not requiring them; and had juſt cauſe to do it, they being grown into ſuch abuſe; beſides, I ſay, the Romaniſts cannot juſtly taxe them for it,

Vide ſtupiditatem noſtram, & perverſitatem. — O præpoſteram Religionem! *Ferus in Mat.* 15.

seeing they themselves have abolished some things, which formerly were observed in the Church, as I have noted before. And to those particulars before mentioned let this be added, that anciently Vigils were in use; both Priests and people used to watch the night before some solemn festival. And when *Vigilantius* spoke against it (though not without cause, as *Polydore Vergil* confesseth) *Hierome* inveighed against him for it, and scoffingly said, that in this he did contrary to his name, that he had more mind to sleep then to watch. But the abuse of these Vigils was such, that (as the said *Polydore Vergil* relateth) though the name continued, yet the thing it self was abolished; and so much also is acknowledged by *Bellarmine*.

Polyd. Verg. de Invent. l.6.c.4.

Nam quòd dicis eum vigilias execrari, facit & hoc contra vocabulum suum, quòd dormire velit Vigilantius. *Hier. ad Riparium, epist.53.*

Polyd. Verg. loc. cit. Bell. de cult. Sanct. l.3.c.17.

Page 100. "The Marquesse speaks of the Church antiently make-
" ing Processions with the Reliques of Martyrs, kissing
" them, &c.

Answ. *Austin* in the place which the Marquesse citeth (viz. *de Civ. Dei, lib.22.cap.8.*) hath much about Miracles wrought at the monuments of some Martyrs: but of honouring or worshipping their Reliques, I do not see any thing that he saith. *Hierome*, indeed, in the place alleadged speaketh of honouring the reliques of Saints, and doth contest with *Vigilantius* about it. But whereas *Vigilantius* did inveigh against the adoring of them, and burning Waxe-candles before them at noon-day, *Hierome* calls him a *mad-brain*, asking, *Who did ever adore Martyrs?* And saying, that they used Wax-lights, not as he did slander them, in the day-time, but only in the night, when there was need of them. And in his Epistle to *Riparius*, which was written about *Vigilantius*, he saith, that they were so far from worshiping the reliques of Martyrs, that they did neither

Dicit (Vigilantius) quid necesse est te tanto honore non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid, quod in modico vasculo transferendo colis? Et rursus in eodem libro; Quid pulverem linteamine circumdatum, adorando oscularis? Et in consequentibus; Prope ritum gentilium videmus sub prætextu religionis introductum in Ecclesias, sole adhuc fulgente moles cereorum accendi &c. Quis enim, ô insanum caput, aliquando martyres adoravit? — Cereos autem non clarâ luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumni aris; sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solatio temperemus, *&c. Hieron. contra Vigilant. cap.2. & 3.*

Nos autem non dico martyrum reliquias, sed ne solem quidem & lunam, non

neither worſhip the ſun, nor the moon, nor Angels or Archangels, nor Cherubim, nor Seraphim, nor any name that is named either in this world, or in that to come. He taxeth *Vigilantius* for grudging, that any reſpect was ſhewed to the reliques of Martyrs, and that they were not rather caſt to the dunghill. If this were his opinion, I think few Proteſtants will plead for him. But howſoever, *Hierome* ſhewes himſelf far from that, which they of the Church of *Rome* do now maintain and practiſe. How exceeding groſſe they are in this kind, *Eraſmus* hath lively ſet forth, and that not in his Colloquies (which he wrote for delight, yet for profit alſo; and as the Poet ſayes, *Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?*) but in a more ſerious work, *viz.* his Annotations on the New Teſtament. *You may now* (ſaith he) *every where ſee held out for gain* Maries *milk, which they honour as much almoſt as Chriſts conſecrated body; prodigious Oile; ſo many peeces of the Croſſe, that if they were all gathered together, a great ſhip would ſcarce carry them: Here* Francis *his Hood ſet forth to view; there the innermoſt Garment of the Virgin* Mary; *in one place* Anna's *Comb, in another place* Joſeph's *Stocking, in another place* Thomas of Canterbury *his Shoe, in another place Chriſts Foreskin, which though it be a thing uncertain, they worſhip more religiouſly then Chriſts whole perſon. Neither do they ſhew theſe things as things that may be born with, and to pleaſe the common people, but they place almoſt all religion in them*, &c.

angelos, non archangelos, non cherubim, non ſeraphim, & omne nomen quod nominatur & in præſenti ſeculo & in futuro, colimus & adoramus, &c. *Hieron. ad Ripar. epiſt. 53.*

Dolet martyrum reliquias pretioſo operiri velamine, & non vel pannis vel cilicio colligari, vel projici in ſterquilinium. *Hieron. adverſ. Vigilant. cap. 2.*

Videas hodiè paſſim ad quæſtū oſtentari lac Mariæ, quod honore propemodum æquant corpori Chriſti conſecrato: prodigioſum oleum; fragmenta crucis tanta multa, ut ſi in acervum rediganter, vix una navis oneraria vehat: hîc oſtentari Franciſci cucullum, illîc intimam veſtem Mariæ virginis; alibi pectinem Annæ, alibi caligam Joſeph, alibi calceum Thomæ Cantuarienſis, alibi Chriſti præputium, quod cum ſit res incerta, religioſiùs adorant quàm totum Chriſtum. Neque verò hæc ita proferunt tanquam toleranda, & plebeculæ donanda affectibus; verùm hue ferè ſumma religionis vocatur, &c. *Eraſ. in Mat. 23. 5.*

From Reliques we paſſe to Pictures. *The Church then* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *had the picture of Chriſt, and of his Saints, both out of Churches, and in them, (not to adore them with god-like worſhip, but) by them to reverence the Souldiers and Champions of Chriſt.* Page 100.

Were

Anſw. Were there no other point but only this concerning Pictures and Images, it were enough to ſhew how much the Church of *Rome* is degenerate. *Irenæus* taxeth the *Carpocratians* (who are alſo called *Gnoſticks*) for having Images, ſome painted, ſome carved; and for ſaying, That when Chriſt was upon earth, his reſemblance was made by *Pilate*. And *Tertullian* not only ſhews, that Chriſtians did not worſhip Images, but he ſpeaks moſt contemptibly of them, calling them *cold Images*, & ſaying that Kites, Mice, & Spiders, do perceive what they are. And he obſerves, that even the heathen Romans themſelves had no Images in the time of *Numa Pompilius*, though he was the deviſer of that ſuperſtition, which was among them. And it is very obſervable, that *Plutarch*, a heathen Writer relates, that *Numa* forbade the Romans to make any Image, whereby to repreſent God; and and that for 170. years the Romans had no Images of a religious nature. *For* (ſaith he) *it is not lawful to repreſent better things by worſe; neither is it poſſible to apprehend God otherwiſe then by the act of the underſtanding.* The Pagan *Cæcilius* upbraided Chriſtians, becauſe they had no Images. *Minutius Felix* granted they had none, ſaying, *What Image ſhall I deviſe of God, ſeeing that, if you conſider well, man himſelf is God's Image?* And when the ſame Pagan objected, that Chriſtians talked of a God, whom they could neither ſhew to others, nor ſee themſelves; *Minutius* anſwered, That by this they did beleeve that there is a God, in that

Etiam imagines, quaſdam quidem depictas, quaſdam autem & de reliquâ materiâ fabricatas habent, dicentes formam Chriſti factam à Pilato, *&c. Iren. lib. 1. cap. 24.*

Si ſtatuas, & imagines frigidas mortuorum ſuorum ſimillimas non adoramus, quas milvi & mures, & aranex intelligunt, nonne laudem magis quàm pœnam merebatur repudium agniti erroris? *Tertul. Apologet. cap. 12.*

Etſi à Numa concepta eſt curioſitas ſuperſtitioſa, nondum tamen aut ſimulachris, aut templis res divina apud Romanos conſtabat. *Ibid. cap. 25.*

Νυμᾶς δὲ διεκώλυσεν ἀνθρωποειδῆ καὶ ζωόμορφον εἰκόνα θεῶ Ρωμαίοις νομίζειν, ὰδ' ἦν παρ' ἀυτοῖς ὅτε γραπτὸν, ὅτε πλαστὸν εἶδος θεῶ πρότερον, ἀλλ' ἑκαστὸν ἐβδομήκοντα τοῖς πρώτοις ἔτεσι ναὸς μὲν οἰκοδομήμενοι καὶ καλιάδας ἱερὰς ἱςῶντες ἄγαλμα δὲ ὰδὲν ἔμμορφον ποιήμενοι διετέλεν. ὡς ὅτε ὅσιον ἀὶ βελτίονα τοῖς χείροσι ἀφομοιῶν, ὅτε ἐφάπτεσθαι θεῶ δυνατὸν ἄλλως ἢ νοήσει. Plut. in Numa.

Cur nullas aras habent, templa nulla, nulla nota ſimulacra? *Cæcil. de Chriſtianis apud Minut.*

Quod enim ſimulachrum Deo fingam, cum ſi rectè exiſtimes, ſit Dei homo ipſe ſimulachrum? *Minut. in Octav.*

Deum illum ſuum, quem nec oſtendere poſſunt nec videre, *&c. Cæcil. ibid.*

At enim quem colimus Deum, nec oſtendimus, nec videmus: imò ex hoc Deum credimus, quod cum ſentire poſſumus, videre non poſſumus. *Minut. ibid.*

that though they could not ſee him, yet they were ſenſible of him. This argues, that Chriſtians then had no Images, as Pagans had; for but by their Images, the Pagans themſelves could neither ſhew, nor ſee the gods that they did worſhip. *Arnobius* alſo writing againſt the Gentiles, reproves them for their Images, ſaying that they ſhewed themſelves not to beleeve that there were any ſuch gods as they pretended to worſhip, ſeeing they muſt have ſome Images to looke on, as if their gods being not ſeen, were not at all. And whereas they did alleadge, that they did worſhip their gods by their Images; he asks them, if except there were ſuch Images, their gods could not tell that they did worſhip them? That of *Epiphanius* is very famous, and moſt remarkable to our purpoſe, which he writes in an Epiſtle to *John* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, which Epiſtle *Hierome* tranſlated out of Greek into Latine. He ſaith, that as he travelled, he happened to eſpy a Vail before a Church door, having in it the Image either as it were of Chriſt, or of ſome other Saint; for he could not remember whoſe Image it was. But when he ſaw ſuch an Image, and knew that it was repugnant to the Scriptures, he tore it in peeces, and counſelled the Church-wardens to make a winding-ſheet of it, to wrap ſome poor man in when he was dead. *Marianus Victorius* (a Romiſh writer) ſaith, *It is wonderfull, how they that oppoſe Images, do exult from this place of Epiphanius.* And I ſay, it is wonderfull, how they that defend Images, are put to their ſhifts to elude this place of *Epiphanius*, it being ſo plain and home againſt them. This

An nunquid dicitis forè præſentiam vobis quandam his numinum exhiberi ſimulachris; & quia Deos videre non datum eſt, eos ita coli, & munia officioſa præſtari? Hoc qui dicit, & aſſerit, Deos eſſe non credit; nec habere convincitur ſuis religionibus fidem, cui opus eſt videre quod teneat, ne inane fortè ſit, quod obſcurum non videtur. Deos (inquitis) per ſimulachra veneramur. Quid ergò, ſi hæc non ſint, coli ſe dii neſciunt, nec impertiri à vobis ullum ſibi exiſtimabunt honorem? *Arnob. contra gent. lib. 6.*

Inveni velum pendens in foribus Eccleſiæ tinctum, atque depictum, & habens imaginem quaſi Chriſti, vel ſancti cujuſdam: non enim ſatis memini cujus imago fuerit. Cum ergò hoc vidiſſem in Eccleſiâ Chriſti contra authoritatem Scripturarum hominis pendere imaginem, ſcidi illud, & magis dedi conſilium cuſtodibus ejuſdem loci, ut pauperem mortuum eo obvolverent, & efferrent. *Epiphan. ad Joham. Hieroſolym. inter opera Hieron. tom. 2. Epiſt. 60.*

Mirum eſt, quàm ex hoc loco Iconomachi hodiè exultent. Cum tamen ipſa verba planè demonſtrent, non Chriſti, aut ſancti alicujus, ſed puri hominis eam fuiſſe imaginem. Imò ſi quis diligenter locum expendet, con-

ſtabit ex eodem contrarium maximè. Cum enim ſuperiùs dicat, *Inveni ibi velum*, &c. dicere videtur, talem fuiſſe eam imaginem, qualis ſoleat eſſe vel Chriſti, vel alicujus Sancti, quæ in Eccleſiis depingi ſolita ſit. *Mar. Victor. in Annotat. ad loc.*

Author ſaith, that *Epiphanius* ſpeaks not of the image of Chriſt, nor of any Saint, but of ſome ordinary man. Yea, he ſaith, if one mark it well, he ſhall find this to be the ſenſe, That it was an Image like the image of Chriſt, or of ſome Saint, which was uſually painted in Churches. What can be a more violent perverting of words then this is? *Bellarmine* therefore diſliking this anſwer, as alſo that which ſome others give, ſaith, that the more common and true anſwer is, that thoſe are none of *Epiphanius* his words, but are ſuppoſititious. But *Hierome*, it ſeems, took them for the words of *Epiphanius*; for elſe he would not have tranſlated them, and joyned them to the Epiſtle as a part of it.

Communior & verior ſolutio eſt, verba illa eſſe ſuppoſititia. *Bell. de Imagin. Sanctor. lib. 2. cap. 9. ſect. Ad Quintum.*

The Marqueſſe, to prove the ancient uſe of Images, cites *Euſeb. de vita Conſt.* but he cites neither book nor chapter, when as there are four books of that ſubject, and in ſome of them above 70. in ſome above 60. and where the feweſt, above 50 chapters. It may be he meaneth that, which *Euſebius* relates *lib.* 1. *cap.* 22, &c. *viz.* That *Conſtantine* in a viſion from heaven ſaw the ſigne of the Croſſe, with this inſcription, *In this overcome!* and being warned by Chriſt in his ſleep to do it, he cauſed that Figure to be painted in his Banner which he uſed in his warres. But Dr. *Rainolds* hath long ſince ſhewed by the deſcription which *Euſebius* makes *cap.* 25. that it was not properly the ſigne of Chriſts Croſſe, though it had ſome reſemblance with a Croſſe, but was indeed the two firſt Letters of the name Χριστὸς *Chriſt*, joyned together thus ☧ ſo that it was the name of Chriſt, that was thus repreſented unto *Conſtantine*. And if it had been the very ſigne of Chriſts Croſſe, yet there being a ſpecial injunction for the making and uſing of it, (for I dare not diſcredit the relation) it would not follow, that therefore ordinarily the picture of Chriſts Croſſe (much leſſe of Chriſt crucified) is lawfull; no more then it follows, that the Jewes might lawfully have brought pictures and images into the Temple, becauſe

Rain. confer. cap. 8.

because God commanded Cherubims to be pictur'd in it *.

* *Si eundem Deum observas, habes legem ejus, Ne feceris similitudinem. Si & præceptum factæ posteà similitudinis respicis, & tu imitare Moſen, Ne facias adverſus legem ſimulacrum aliquod, niſi & tibi Deus juſſerit.* Tertul. de Idolol. cap. 5.

The Marqueſſe alſo doth alleadge *Baſil. in Martyr. Bar.* But, 1. *Bellarmine* (whom it is likely the Marqueſſe followed) underſtands (or would have others to underſtand) *Baſil* ſo, as if he had ſeen the picture of Martyr *Barlaam* (of whom he was ſpeaking) ſomwhere in the Church, whereas in *Baſil* there appears no ſuch matter. Only he calls upon the famous Painters, and bids them ſhew forth their art in drawing the pourtraicture of this Martyr. 2. I ſee not why by Painters there muſt be meant ſuch as are properly ſo called; but that the word may be taken metaphorically for Orators, whom *Baſil* would have to ſet forth the praiſes of the Martyr more lively then he had done. 3. However it were in *Baſils* time, yet the more ancient Writers, as *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Arnobius*, and *Minutius*, (who are before cited) ſhew that in their time Images were not in uſe. And to thoſe may be added *Clemens Alexandrinus* (who was almoſt 200 yeares before *Baſil*) who proceeds ſo far as to make it unlawful for Chriſtians to exerciſe the Art of Painting or Image-making; ſo far was the Church then from uſing any ſuch Pictures or Images as we now treat of. And he tels the Heathens, that they were very ſtudious to make an Image as fair and beautiful as might be, but had no care to keep themſelves from being like to images in ſtupidity. 4. A long time after *Baſil*, when images came to be uſed in Churches for hiſtory ſake, yet they were not worſhipped. *Gregory* Biſhop of *Rome* (above 200 years

Bell. de imagin. Sanctor. l. 2. c. 9.

Ἀνάστητε νῦν μοι ὦ λαμπροὶ τῶν ἀθλητικῶν κατορθωμάτων ζωγράφοι, τὸν τῆς ἀγλαΐας κολοβωθεῖσαν εἰκόνα ταῖς ὑμετέραις μεγαλωστὶ τέχναις. *Baſil. homil. in Martyr. Barl.*

Καὶ γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἀπηγόρευται ἡμῖν ἀναφανδὸν ἀπατηλὸν ὀφείλειν τέχνην. ἡ γὰρ ποίησις φησὶν ὁ προφήτης παντὸς ὁμοίωμα &c. *Clem. Alex. in Protrept. edit. Græc. in fol. pag. 24.*

Ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς μὲν ὅπως ποτὲ ὁ ἀνδριὰς ὅτι μάλιστα ὡραιότατος τεκταίνηται, προσκαρτερεῖτε: ὅπως δὲ αὐτοὶ μὴ ὅμοιοι δι' ἀναισθησίαν τοῖς ἀνδριᾶσιν ἀποτελεσθῆτε, οὐ φροντίζετε. *Ibid. pag. 25.*

Zelum vos, ne quid manu factum adorari poſſit, habuiſſe laudamus; ſed frangere caſdé imagines non debuiſſe judicamus. Idcircò enim pictura in eccleſiis adhibetur, ut hi qui literas neſciunt,

years

saltem in parietibus videndo legant, quæ legere in codicibus non valent. Tua ergo paternitas & illas servare, & ab earum adoratu populum prohibere debuit, &c. *Greg. lib. 7. Epist. 111.*

Et quidem quòd eas adorari vetuisses, omnino laudamus; fregisse vero reprehendimus. —— Si quis imagines facere voluerit, minimè prohibe; adorare vero imagines, modis omnibus devita. *Greg. lib. 9. Epist. 9.*

years after *Basils* time) hearing that *Serenus* Bishop of *Massilia* had broken certain Images that were in Churches, because some did worship them, wrote unto him about it, and commended him for his zeal in not allowing Images to be worshipped, yet disliked his breaking of them, saying that such as cannot read, may be instructed by them. And to the same purpose he wrote unto him again, willing him not to hinder the making of Images, but by all means to hinder the worshipping of them.

Non solùm autem licere in Ecclesiâ imagines habere, & illis honorem & cultum adhibere ostendet Parochus, cum honos, qui eis exhibetur, referatur ad prototypa, verùm etiam maximo fidelium bono ad hanc usque diem factum declarabit. *Catechis. Trident. p. 43. edit. Colon. an. 1567.*

Sequitur quòd eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi, & ipsi Christo. Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione latriæ, consequens est, quòd ejus imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda. *Thom. part. 3. qu. 25. art. 3.*

But what more common now in the Church of *Rome*, then to worship Images? Their Trent-catechisme requires the Parish-Priest to instruct people, that the worshipping of Images is not only lawful, seeing that the honour done to them, redounds to those things that are represented by them, but also very profitable. And the prime Doctors of the Church of *Rome* hold, that the very same worship belongs to the Image, which belongs to that which it represents. *The same reverence* (saith Aquinas) *is to be exhibited to the image of Christ, as to Christ himself. And therefore seeing Christ is worshipped with divine worship, it follows, that his Image is to be worshipped with divine worship.* So *Bonaventure* saith, *All reverence which is shewed to the image of Christ, is shewed to Christ himself: and therefore the image of Christ ought to be worshipped with divine worship.* And *Bellarmine* mentions divers of their School-men besides, as *Cajetane*, *Marsilius*, *Almain*, *Carthusianus*, *Capreolus*, and others, that did hold this opinion. And though he himself labour to qualifie the matter with distinctions, which few

Omnis reverentia, quæ imagini Christi offertur, exhibetur Christo. Et propterea imagini Christi debet cultus latriæ exhiberi. *Bonav. in Sent. lib. 3. dist. 9. art. 1. quæst. 2.*

Bell. de Imag. lib. 2. cap. 20.

few understand, yet he grants, that improperly and by accident images may be worshipped with the same kinde of worship wherewith the sampler is worshipped. *And thus Preachers* (he saith) *speak to the image of Christ crucified, and say, Thou hast redeemed us, thou hast reconciled us unto the Father.* I will only here adde the words of Sir *Edwin Sands*, who speaking of the scandals of Christians which hinder the conversion of the Jews, saith thus; *But the greatest scandal of all other is their worshipping of Images, for which both Jews and Turks call them Idolatrous Christians. --- And therefore they say, for their comming to the Christian Sermons, that as long as they shall see the Preacher direct his speech and prayer to that little woodden Crucifixe, which stands on the Pulpit by him, to call it his Lord and Saviour, to kneel to it, to imbrace it, and kisse it, to weep upon it (as is the fashion of Italy) this is preaching sufficient for them, and perswades them more with the very sight of it to hate Christian Religion, then any reason that the world can alleadge to love it.*

Admitti potest, imagines posse coli impropriè vel per accidens eodem genere cultûs, quo examplar ipsum colitur. --- Sic concionatores alloquuntur imaginem crucifixi, eique dicunt, Tu nos redemisti, tu nos Patri reconciliasti, &c. *Bell. de Imagin. lib. 2 cap. 20.*

Europ. Specul. page 228. & 230.

Whereas the Marquesse speaks immediately after of the sign of the Crosse; I grant, that anciently it was much used by Christians, as appears by *Tertullian*. But besides that he confesseth, that there is no Scripture for it, and other things which likewise they did observe; besides this, I say, he speaks nothing of adoring of the Crosse; and *Minutius Felix*, who lived about the same time with *Tertullian*, is expresse against it. When *Cecilius* objected against Christians, that they worshipped the wood of a Crosse, *Minutius* answered saying, *We neither worship, nor desire Crosses.* The Author, that the Marquesse alleadeth to prove the ancient adoration of the Crosse, viz. *Paulinus*, I have not, and therefore

Page 100.

Adomnem progressum, atque promotum, ad omnem aditum & exitum, ad vestitum & calceatum, ad lavacra mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quacunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis signaculo terimus. *Tertull. de Cor. Mil. cap. 3.*

Harum & aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules Scripturarum, nullam invenies. *Ibid.*

Et qui hominem summo supplicio pro facinore punitum, & crucis ligna feralia eorum ceremonios fabulantur, congruentia perditis sceleratisque tribuunt altaria, ut id colant quod merentur. *Cæcil. apud Minut.*

Cruces etiam nec colimus, nec optamus. *Minut. in Octav.*

cannot examine what he ſaith; but howſoever, he was above two hundred years after *Minutius*; and *Gregory*, who was about as much after *Paulinus*, was againſt the worſhipping of any thing made with hands, as appears by the words before cited.

Page 101. *Finally* (ſaith the Marqueſſe) *the Church then held, that to the Catholick Church only belongs the keeping of the Apoſtolical tradition, the authority of interpretation of Scripture, and the deciſion of controverſies of faith: and that out of the ſucceſſion of her communion of her doctrine, and her miniſtery, there neither was Church, nor ſalvation.*

Anſw. 1. For Apoſtolical traditions, enough hath been ſaid before. 2. And ſo alſo of interpretation of Scripture, and deciſion of controverſies of faith. 3. I underſtand not what is meant by objecting againſt us, that out of the Catholick Church there is no Church. For the Catholick Church being the Church univerſal, and ſo comprehending all particular Churches as parts and members of it, who can doubt, that there is no Church out of the Church Catholick? But what is this to the Church of *Rome*, which once indeed was a ſound part of the Catholick Church, but the Catholick Church it never was, nor could be, except a part could be the whole?

In that which follows, *page* 101. *&c.* there is nothing but the ſame matter as before, only the form is ſomewhat altered, and therefore there is no need that I ſhould trouble either my ſelf, or the Reader any further about it; only I ſhall adde one or two Animadverſions. 1. Whereas it is objected (*page* 105. *&c.*) that *Luther*, after his deſerting the communion of the Church of *Rome*, did yet hold ſome points of Popery; and ſo alſo *Huſſe*, and *Wickliffe*, and others, that otherwiſe oppoſed themſelves againſt the errors and corruptions of that Church. I anſwer, That as *Rome* was not built at once, ſo neither was it demoliſhed at once, but by degrees: it is no marvel therefore, if thoſe worthy men did (at leaſt for a while) retain ſome Romiſh opinions and practices, after that in many things they had diſcovered the truth, and ſtood up in defence of it. 2. Whereas it is

pre-

pretended (*page* 106.) that before *Berengarius*, who was above 1000. years after Christ, none did oppose that reall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which the Romanists maintain; besides that I have sufficiently confuted this before, the Marquesse might have seen from *Bellarmine* himself, that there were some, who above 200. years before *Berengarius*, did oppose that doctrine, which in this particular the Church of *Rome* now doth hold, namely *Bertram* a Presbyter, who was about 800. years after Christ, and (saith *Bellarmine*) was one of the first that did call in question that doctrine. But *Bellarmine* doth too much mince the matter; for *Bertram* did more then call in question that reall presence of Christ in the Sacrament, which the Romanists do hold; he did plainly assert that which Protestants maintain, *viz.* that the substance of bread and wine doth still remain after consecration, as is to be seen in *Hospinians* first part of the Sacramentary history, and so in others that cite that Author; for the book it self (I confesse) I have not seen, that I do remember. But that is here worthy to be observed, which the Romish censurers of Books say, speaking of this book of *Bertrams* about the Sacrament; *Although* (say they) *we do not much value this book, nor should greatly care if it were no where to be found, yet seeing it hath been often printed, and read of very many,* &c. *and we suffer very many errours in other ancient Catholicks; we extenuate them, we excuse them, and finding out some device, we often deny them, and fain some good sense of them, when they are opposed in disputations, or conflicts with the adversaries; we see not why* Bertram *may not deserve the same favour, and diligent recognition, lest Hereticks prate against us, and say, that we burn antiquity, and prohibit it, when it makes for them.*

Hic autor primus fuit, qui seriò, & copiosè scripsit de veritate corporis & sanguinis Domini in Eucharistiâ contra Bertramum Presbyterum, qui fuit ex primis qui eam in dubium revocarunt. *Bell. de Paschasio Ratberto in lib. de Scriptor. Eccles.*

Quanquam librum istum magni non existimemus momenti, itaque non magnoperè laboraturi simus, si vel nusquam sit, vel intercidat; attamen cum jam sæpè recusus sit, & lectus à plurimis, &c. in veteribus Catholicis aliis plurimos feramus errores, & extenuemus, excusemus, excogitato commento persæpè negemus, & commodum iis sensum affinganus, dum opponuntur in disputationibus, aut in conflictionibus cum adversariis; non videmus cur non eandem æquitatem, & diligentem recognitonem mereatur Bertramus, ne hæretici ogganniant nos antiquitatem pro ipsis facientem exurere, & prohibere. *Index Expurgat. an.* 1599. *pag.* 12.

Some

Non malè aut inconsultò igitur omittantur omnia hæc à pa.3. (Considerandum quoq; quòd in pane illo &c.) usque ad illud multo post (Sed aliud est quod exterius geritur, *&c.*) — Legendum. invisibiliter pro visibiliter. *Ibid.p.16. & 17.*

Some things therefore in *Bertrams* book they will have to be quite left out, and some things to be quite altered, as namely for *visibly* to be read *invisibly*. Such devices have they of the Church of *Rome* to corrupt ancient Writers, when they make against them, and then they pretend that all are for them. Thus the Marquesse in the conclusion of his Reply (page 230.) pretends, that they have the *prescription of* 1600. *years possession and continuance of their Churches Doctrine, and evidence out of the word of God, and the Fathers witnessing to that evidence, and the decrees of Councels, and Protestants own acknowlegdements.* But what ground there is for this pretence, let the Reader judge by comparing and considering what is said on both sides. And so I also shall leave the successe of my labour unto God, in whose hand are the hearts of all.

An

An Addition of ſome few things omitted in the fore-going REJOINDER.

THe Marqueſſe, *pag.* 69. citeth *Baſil orat. in* 40 (it is miſprinted 44) *Mart.* as affirming that we may pray unto the Saints departed. But in that Oration *Baſil* affirms no ſuch thing: He ſhews indeed his approbation of praying (not unto the Martyrs, but, which is quite another thing) to God at the monuments of the Martyrs. The moſt learned B. *Uſher* obſerves, That *the memory of the Martyrs indeed was from the very beginning had in great reverence; and at their Memorials and Martyria, that is to ſay, at the places wherein their bodies were laid, (which were the Churches, whereunto the Chriſtians did in thoſe times uſually reſort) prayers were ordinarily offered up unto God, for whoſe cauſe they laid down their lives.* But this is no argument, that they then prayed to the Martyrs, though that errour might take occaſion (afterwards) to creep in by this meanes.

Ἐνταῦθα γοῦν ἐυσεβὴς ὑπὲρ τέκνων ἐυχομένη καταλαμβάνεται, ἀποδημοῦντι ἀνδρὶ τὴν ἐπάνοδον αἰτουμένη, ἀῤῥωστοῦντι τὴν σωτηρίαν μετὰ μαρτύρων γενέσθω τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν. *Baſil. orat. in* 40 *Martyres.*

B. *Uſh.* Anſwer of Prayer to Saints, *pa.* 434.

The Marqueſſe taxeth *Calvin* for holding, that Chriſts ſoule was ſubject to ignorance. To what I have already ſaid in anſwer to this charge, I adde, that in this particular *Fulgentius* was of the ſame minde with *Calvin*. For confuting thoſe that held Chriſt to have no humane ſoul, he ſaith thus: *If we muſt believe that the humane nature in Chriſt wanted a ſoul, what is it, that in Chriſt being an Infant, is ſaid not to have known good and evil?* (Then he cites *Iſa.* 7. 16. expounding it of Chriſt, and addes) *Therefore the humane ſoule, which is naturally made capable of reaſon, in Chriſt being an Infant, is ſaid not to have known good and evil; which according to the truth of the Goſpel, in Chriſt being a child, is related to have increaſed in wiſdome,* &c.

Si anima vel intellectus naturæ in Chriſto defuiſſe credetur humanæ, quid in infante bonum malúmque dicitur ignoraſſe? (*citat* Iſa. 7. 16. *atque addit*) Anima igitur humana, quæ rationis capax naturaliter facta eſt, bonum malúmque in infante Chriſto neſciiſſe dicitur, quæ ſecundum Evangelicam veritatem in puero Jeſu ſapientiâ & gratiâ profeciſſe narratur. *Fulgent. ad Traſim. lib.* 1.

To that also that hath been said before concerning *Calvins* death, let this be added: How far *Calvin* was from despairing at his death, as the Marquesse doth object, may appear by what he wrote to his dear friend *Farel*, when he looked for death every moment. *I hardly breath* (saith he) *and expect continually that breath should fail me. It is enough that I live and dye to Christ, who to those that are his is both in life and death advantage.* This (as appears by the date of the Epistle) *Calvin* wrote at *Geneva* the second day of *May*, in the year 1564. and (as *Bucholcerus* in his Chronology notes out of *Beza*) the twenty seventh day of the same moneth he dyed.

Ægrè spiritum traho, & assiduè expecto dum me anhelitus deficiat. Satis est quòd Christo vivo, & morior, qui suis lucrum est in vitâ & morte. *Calv. Epist.* 344.

The Marquesse, page 99. speaks of Marriage as anciently held by the Church to be a true and proper Sacrament. This particular I omitted, having spoken of the rest which he there mentioneth, to wit, Confirmation, Orders, and Extreme Unction, in answer to that which elsewhere he saith of them. For Marriage therefore, 1. There is nothing in the Scripture to prove it a Sacrament properly so called. That of the Apostle so much insisted on, *This is a great mystery*, Ephes. 5.32. Their own Cardinal *Cajetane* upon the place confesseth to make nothing to the purpose. 2. That the Fathers call Marriage a Sacrament, doth not evince that they thought it to be of the same nature with Baptisme and the Lords Supper. For (as I have before shewed) they often use the word *Sacrament* largely, and apply it to divers things, which even in our Adversaries account properly are no Sacraments. 3. *Durandus* an acute and learned School-man, who lived about the year 1320. doth hold, that though Marriage be a sign of a holy thing (to wit, the conjunction of Christ and the Church) and so in a large sense a Sacrament, yet it is no Sacrament strictly and properly so called, nor of the same nature

Non habes ex hoc loco prudens Lector à Paulo conjugium esse Sacramentum. *Cajetan. in Ephes.* 5.32.

Argumenta prima probant, quòd matrimonium non est sacramentum strictè & proprie dictum, sicut alia sacramenta novæ Legis; sed non probant quin sit sacræ rei signum, & sic largo modo sacramentum. *Durand. in Sent. lib.* 4. *dist.* 26. *quæst.* 3. *num.* 15.

nature with the other Sacraments of the New Testament, to wit, Baptisme, and the Lords Supper: and this he confirms by divers arguments. I know *Bellarmine* indeavours to answer *Durandus* his arguments; but his answers are confuted by *Amesius* and others, and therefore I will not stand about them. I will only prove from *Bellarmine* himself, that Marriage is properly no Sacrament. Every Sacrament properly so called, is administred by some other, and not by the same party, to whom it is administred. But Marriage is not administred by some other, but by parties themselves that are married, whiles they mutually expresse their consent one to the other: Therefore Marriage is no Sacrament properly so called. *Bellarmine* doth own both the Proposition and the Assumption, and therefore he may not deny the Conclusion. This is *argumentum ad hominem* (as they call it) of force against *Bellarmine*: I do not see what he could, or any holding his principles can answer to it. But to make the argument simply and absolutely convincing, I will frame it otherwise. For indeed the Proposition laid down by *Bellarmine* is not simply and absolutely true, to wit, *Every Sacrament properly so called is administred by some other, and not by the same party to whom it is administred.* This is not essential to a Sacrament; for then the Lords Supper should be no Sacrament to the Minister himself, but only to those that communicate with him. And so if *Abraham* did circumcise himself, (as is probable he did) his Circumcision should have been no Sacrament unto him, which is most absurd. Thus therefore I frame the argument: Every Sacrament of the New Testament is to be administred by such as are peculiarly appointed of God to be Ministers of his holy things. But Marriage is not administred by such; Therefore it is not a Sacrament of the New Testament. In the Proposition I say, *Every Sacrament of the New Testament*, because whether it were so in respect of

Commune est omnibus Sacramentis, ut ab alio dentur, ab alio accipiantur; neque ullus sibi ipse Sacramentum administret. *Bellar. de Missa lib. 1. c. 22. in initio.*

Matrimonium non eget alio Ministro præter ipsos contrahentes. *Bel. de Matr. l. 1. c. 5. sect. Atque hinc. Et c. 6 sect. Ex his.*

Necesse est conjuges ipsos esse proprios hujus Sacramenti Ministros. *Et ibid. sect. Neque absurdum.* Propriè qui Matrimonii Sacramentum efficiunt, ipsi conjuges sunt.

Circumcision, the ſtory of *Zipporah*, and ſome other places of Scripture perhaps may make it queſtionable. But for the Sacraments of the New Teſtament, our Saviour hath ordained thoſe that are Miniſters of the word to have the adminiſtration of them alſo, *Mat.*28.19,20. And the Apoſtle bids, *Let a man ſo account of us as of the Miniſters of Chriſt, and ſtewards of the myſteries of God*, 1 Cor.4.1. The Sacraments therefore being the myſteries of God, only the Miniſters of Chriſt are now the ſtewards and diſpencers of them. But this is not neceſſarily requiſite in the point of Marriage, that a Miniſter ſhould diſpence it. Though ordinarily a Miniſter be imployed in the celebration of Marriage, for the inſtructing and exhorting of the parties married, and for praying unto God for his bleſſing upon them; yet this is not by Chriſts peculiar appointment, but only (as our Adverſaries confeſſe) by the Churches order, and therefore not ſimply neceſſary; Marriage were every way compleat, though no Miniſter were imployed in it, though in divers reſpects that is expedient; but howſoever properly the parties themſelves that are married, are they by whom Marriage is adminiſtred, whiles they give themſelves each to other.

Quanquam requiritur ex decreto Eccleſiæ Miniſter Eccleſiaſticus, qui conſenſum conjugum exquirat, & eundem approbet & declaret, & benedictione Sacerdotali confirmet; tamen propriè qui Matrimonii Sacramentum efficiunt ipſi conjuges ſunt. *Bell. de Matr. l.1. c.6. ſect. Neque abſurdum.*

The End.

Errata in the *Firſt Part.*

*Pag.*114. Properly, *read* pioully. *p.*121. deceived, *r.* deceaſed. *p.*122 ſaw, *r.* ſlew. *p.*123. work, *r.* rock. *p.*124. that, *r.* not. *p.*136. ſuppoſition. *r.* ſuſpition. *p.*166. *Patres*, lege *fratres*. *p.*205. reply, *r.* rely. *p.*214. thy, merit, *r.* my merit. *ibid.* die, *r.* did. *nomen*, l. *nomine*. *p.*215. *diſcente*, l. *dicente*. *p.*222. So ſay the Tranſlators, *&c.* *That hath reference to thoſe words*, Some may, and indeed do ſay, &c. *ibid.* inevitable, *r.* inevitably. be being, *blot out* being. *p.*230. If the Apoſtle had —— *adde theſe words*, conſidered mankind as corrupt, he would not have ſaid. *p.*231. faſtned, *r.* faſhioned. *p.*235. were affirmed, *r.* we affirm. *p.*252. to, *r.* do. *p.*262. liking *r.* living. *p.*291. *Lombard* who, *blot out* who.

Errata in the *Second Part.*

*Pag.*26. this ſame, *r.* the ſame. *p.*40. at leaſt, *r.* at furtheſt. *p.*45. commending, *r.* contending.